DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 044 AC 004 564

By-Drucker, Peter F.; And Others

Oakland Papers: Symposium on Social Change and Educational Continuity. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, 51.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.

Pub Date 66

Note-80p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.10

Descriptors-*Alumni Education, Anxiety, *Continuous Learning, Educational Change, *General Education, Institutional Environment, Learning Processes, Self Concept, *Social Change, Technological Advancement, *Universities, Values

The symposium was a result of an experimental alumni education program at Oakland University which was sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation and brought about by Oakland's intent to establish a new university relationship with its graduates based on continuing education. In "The University in an Educated Society" Peter Drucker speaks of learning patterns demanded by a highly technical society. Max Lerner illuminates the global crises man faces as a builder of society and the learning competencies his tasks will require in his essay "The University in an Age of Revolutions." In "The University and the Age of Anxiety" Rollo May provides an exploration of man's drive for an expanding consciousness, and the needs this process generates which current educational practices do not meet. "The University and Institutional Change" by Margaret Mead addresses a crucial institutional problem: how can educational institutions suitable to our age be fashioned when invariably we must begin in the middle of old commitments and dispositions? (se)

ED0 30044

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OAKLAND PAPERS

Symposium On Social Change and Educational Continuity

PETER F. DRUCKER
MAX LERNER
ROLLO MAY
MARGARET MEAD

edited by:
JAMES B. WHIPPLE and
GARY A. WODITSCH

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

AC 004 564

THE CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1966 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

The four essays which constitute the Oakland Papers mark an attempt to inform the ways of the university with a new perception of the world it serves. This is not to suggest that universities should be fashioned in subservience to social climate. A university must remain loyal to the ancient and venerable goals of her sister institutions, but if her loyalty has backbone, she will find herself striving to achieve those goals in the world she currently occupies. The Oakland Papers suggest that effective pursuit of the goals of higher education in an age characterized by radical change may require extensive institutional shifts of emphasis and technique. The university with the courage to champion the cause of liberal education will be called upon to alter traditional approaches, largely because our age is not kind to past achievement. It blithely ignores what "worked" yesterday and thinks nothing of converting today's innovation into tomorrow's obsolescence. Universities may have to console themselves with only the spirit of their heritage, while they cast freely elsewhere for the form and method of their mission.

With well-earned respect to their authors, the Oakland Papers must also be viewed as the product of a university's self-scrutiny. Oakland University was fashioned on the threshold of the 1960's, and her planners —men and women sensitive to the forces shaping the world beyond that threshold—insisted that one of the new institution's basic responsibilities be a dedication to continuing education. This dedication was to be expressed as an integral, not an auxiliary, university function.[1] A new university is permitted only the briefest of infancies, and if new ideas are to find lasting expression in her performance, they must be established early and pursued with great energy.

Under the able direction of Dean Lowell Eklund, a vigorous continuing education program was launched fully a year prior to Oakland's acceptance of her first undergraduate students. Dean Eklund's work in turn generated an innovative concept of alumni education, based on the notion that

---

1. See Appendix III, p. 75.

universities across the nation could ultimately cooperate in mounting an intensive, systematic program to serve alumni learning needs. Kellogg Foundation sponsorship brought the alumni education concept into being as an experimental program and has recently expanded it to full-fledged pilot status. As the alumni and continuing education programs pursued their objectives, certain educational assumptions were brought under question. Is learning viewed as a life-long process the proper focus of a university's concern? Could it be that the likenesses far outstripped the differences between the university's commitment to serve undergraduates and her commitment to serve adults? Is it the case that education, to be liberal, must be continuing? In an effort to probe issues such as these and illuminate the core relationships that ought to be nurtured between the undergraduate and continuing education functions of the university, the Alumni Education Department in consultation with representatives of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults proposed the staging of a Continuing University Symposium Series.

The Oakland Papers are edited transcripts of the four keynote addresses presented during this symposium series. We are indebted to Margaret Mead, Peter Drucker, Max Lerner, and Rollo May for their thoughtful investigations of the university and its milieu on behalf of continuing education. For the many hours of fruitful discussion which unfortunately could not be captured in this publication, we thank our symposium panelists.[2] They stimulated a process of inquiry which continues its impact on the Oakland community. We extend our gratitude to the Kellogg Foundation for their sponsorship of the series and to the CSLEA for their publication of the Oakland Papers and for their invaluable assistance throughout the program. Finally, there is tribute due the Oakland faculty, students, and guest participants for constituting the kind of mature community capable of sustaining such productive introspection. It is to this spirit of self-scrutiny, wherever it exists in the world of higher education, that we dedicate this publication.

Durward B. Varner
Chancellor
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

---

[2] See Appendix I, p. 71.

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION . . . . Gary A. Woditsch 1

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN EDUCATED SOCIETY
. . . . Peter F. Drucker 5

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN AGE OF REVOLUTIONS
. . . . Max Lerner 16

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN AGE OF ANXIETY. . . Rollo May 33

THE UNIVERSITY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE
. . . . Margaret Mead 52

UNDER DISCUSSION. . . . . James B. Whipple 63

APPENDIX I Symposium Panelists. 71

APPENDIX II The Oakland Plan for Alumni Education . . 73

APPENDIX III Relation of Alumni Education to the Total University. 75

INTRODUCTION

by

Gary A. Woditsch

The Oakland Papers were occasioned by a process which began in February, 1963, with the establishment of an experimental alumni education program at Oakland University.[1] The program was sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation and motivated by Oakland's conviction that it could establish a new university-alumni relationship with its fledgling graduates based on continuing educational service rather than periodic nostalgia. Its thrust was to provide college graduates with systematic counsel in identifying and meeting their life-long educational needs. The Department which was to administer the program became a counseling center and clearing house of information on educational resources available to alumni. Emphasis was placed on locating resources most accessible to the graduate, with no partiality to his Alma Mater. A multiphased action program was tailored to focus on such key concerns as undergraduate orientation, senior and alumni counseling, university-graduate-employer liaison, and particularly, on inter-institutional cooperation in extending alumni education counseling services. The Department then opened its doors to Oakland's Engineering and Business Administration charter graduates in April, 1963.

As the program developed a history of service to alumni, it became apparent that those graduates for whom the motivation to learn had become a permanent commitment made most effective use of the Alumni Education Department's resources. The Department's concern for increasing the number of graduates who had in fact developed an independent motivation for inquiry was seen to mesh with the core concerns of Oakland's undergraduate program. A group of ten faculty representing a wide variety of disciplines joined in a process of investigation and experimentation which continues to this day. The object of the search is the development of a pedagogy which can effectively generate learning motivation based on rewards intrinsic to the learning process itself.

---

[1] See Appendix II, p. 73.

As the concern for the development of the habitual learner matured on the Oakland Campus, there emerged the possibility of a much broader and more thoroughgoing application of the principles which gave rise to Oakland's continuing and alumni education programs. The Continuing University Symposium Series was inaugurated to explore the problems confronting a new type of university—one conceived as dedicated to the development of the continuing learner. Out of the series emerged the Oakland Papers, and out of these essays arises a persistent image of the crucial role learning must play in the affairs of contemporary man.

Present educational forms and institutions are products of an age which understood learning as a partial life function; largely a routine activity undertaken by youth in preparation for a mature life of doing. The accelerated change which confronts today's adult demands a reinterpretation of the learning process and proposes that learning be viewed as a constant life function. The approach of the habitual inquirer which impels him to question, absorb data, formulate, judge, act, evaluate, and question again is now the standard pattern for those who wish to remain free agents in a world of phenomenal change.

The evolution which learning has undergone from partial to constant utility in life takes on major significance for the educational planner. As the individual's confrontation by change quickens pace and his learning needs increase, the mediating function of the teaching institution grows more cumbersome. There is less time and occasion for the institution to serve as an interpreter of change, more demand that it shift emphasis away from communication of pre-structured knowledge toward the expansion and development of the individual's own knowledge-generating abilities. One begins to glimpse a future in which learning in the old sense is no longer the province of the classroom. The individual learns throughout life. He learns as he engages the world. He learns how to learn in the classroom.

These tenets, certainly not new to educational theorists, suggest new scaffolding for many of the contemporary issues of higher education. Rather than moribund divisions of the educational concern into fragmented issues about "teaching adults," there emerges the possibility of a continuum of concern from youth through old age for the development of the capacities required by the continuing learner. Educational institutions serving the various age groups of this span would focus on the development of competent learners rather than certified graduates. There is reason to suspect that the two are not always synonymous.

/In an effort to provide at least a partial outline of a university committed to becoming such a "learning institution"—a continuing, or to use Max Lerner's phrase, open-ended university—the following propositions were framed and distributed to participants in the symposium series.

1. The traditional concept of providing a "liberal education" on the basis of a fairly rigid content curriculum within a 4-year time span is no longer adequate. The accelerated expansion of both positive and theoretical knowledge demands that universities address their 4-year undergraduate programs directly to the task of developing learning competencies on the part of their students which will sustain a liberalizing process beyond graduation.
2. The relatively effective and well-established university techniques of challenging and exercising the student's intellectual capacity should be matched by a similar competence and concern for challenging the student's attitude toward the learning process. In the development of a liberal orientation, the question of how a student tends to employ and commit his mind is equally as important as how good a mind he has. Unchallenged tendencies of mind may be just as educable as unchallenged mental capacity.
3. A university which chooses to maintain a dedication to "liberal education" in our age must not confine this concern to a certain segment of the academic spectrum (i.e., some grouping of the humanities or the liberal arts). Every academic discipline represented in the institution shares the institutional responsibility to advance the liberal orientation of the undergraduate.
4. Finally, such an institution must be prepared to extend its concern for its students beyond graduation. It must remain a vital educational resource in their lives and in the life of the adult community, and seek meaningful vehicles of service through which it can effectively express this commitment.

An accompanying statement read:

The uniqueness of such an institution would lie in placing a premium on the student's personal, critical evaluation of the meaning and value of learning, and in applying educational methods designed precisely to achieve such an evaluation.

During its undergraduate program, such an institution would concentrate on the objective of achieving a liberally oriented student, fully equipped with subject content as are students from the traditional schools, but specially equipped with the conviction that learning, if liberal, continues, and that their university is geared to assist, counsel, and direct them in the process. During the postgraduate years, such a university would not attempt to be the major source of educational experience for its graduates, but would seek to relate them to the best, conveniently located, educational resources available to suit their specific needs. Hopefully, such a university would itself grow immeasurably as a source of liberal dialogue and become a vital focus for the on-going intellectual life of its adult community.

Whatever else may be said of our hypothetical university, its continuing education role is no afterthought, but rather a seamless extension of its primary objective: development of the continuing learner.

In the following essays, Peter Drucker speaks incisively of the learning patterns demanded by a highly technical society. Max Lerner illuminates the profound, global crises man faces as a builder of society, and the learning competencies his tasks will require. Rollo May provides an exploration of man's drive for an expanding consciousness, and the needs this process generates which current educational practices do not meet. Margaret Mead addresses the crucial institutional problem of conversion: how does one fashion an educational institution suitable to our age when one must invariably begin in the middle of old commitments and dispositions?

The Oakland Papers contain no blueprint of tomorrow's continuing university. But if the reader finds as he proceeds through them that their exploration of our age and its educational posture causes him to sketch on his own, he will have captured the spirit of our symposia participants. It may be hoped that his own sketch will be more like than unlike our own. Whatever the case, the Oakland Papers levy two imperatives on the educational designer who seeks to address the needs of our age. The first is a caution—no easy extensions or multiplications of old educational practices will suffice. The second is a promise—the designer who succeeds will see in his accomplishment no mere manipulation of old influences, but a breakthrough to the awareness and development of totally new human competencies and alternatives.

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN EDUCATED SOCIETY

by

Peter F. Drucker

Drucker begins his analysis by drawing a picture of today's college student as he will be at thirty-five. He will be a member of the first privileged majority in history. He will work with and through knowledge rather than with his hands, or even with people. He will work in a fairly large organization where his work will be highly specialized and from which family, home, and other social life will be barred. It is quite unlikely that he will apply to his job a dozen years from now the matter he is learning in college today.

Drucker sees the new educated society as a society with many new commitments by university and individual to continuing education, commitments to the application of knowledge, and commitments to the development of the whole human being, to a personal life as well as work. With such ends in view, we educators will need new approaches. We will need to learn, first, how to communicate intelligibly about highly specialized subjects so as to make ourselves understood. Second, we must reconsider the opposition of specialist and generalist—at best it is a meaningless construct, and may even be obscurantist. Third, since there will be no terminal education, we must reconsider when to teach what. Finally we must create the ability and motivation to keep on learning—to place emphasis in our educational approach to the continuing excitement of coming to grips with what is unknown, rather than a commonplace acceptance of what is already known.

* * *

Peter F. Drucker is an educator and management consultant, who is recognized as a leading analyst of the socio-economic forces of our age. Probably most widely known as an author, he has written many works. These include THE END OF ECONOMIC MAN, THE FUTURE OF INDUSTRIAL MAN, CONCEPT OF THE CORPORATION, THE NEW SOCIETY, PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT, AMERICA'S NEXT TWENTY YEARS, LANDMARKS OF TOMORROW, POWERS AND DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA, and most recently, MANAGING FOR RESULTS.

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN EDUCATED SOCIETY

The last election still echoed and re-echoed the battle cries of the "Welfare State." But the United States is rapidly becoming something quite different: an "Education State." We as a country already spend almost as much on schooling as on defense—and will within a few years spend more, even if defense spending continues to rise. Shortly, by the early seventies, one out of three Americans alive will be in school, most of them full-time. Education has clearly emerged as the central resource of a modern society, but also as its biggest investment. In fact what keeps the "undeveloped" countries "undeveloped" is very largely that they cannot spare the tremendous expenditure needed to become educated societies. And in the two countries which so far have managed to develop themselves rapidly—Japan in the second half of the nineteenth century and Russia in the first half of this century—the transformation of a largely pre-literate into a highly educated society in a few short decades has been the real secret of their success.

What is the role of the university in the "Educated Society"?

To answer this question I propose to focus on the educational needs today's undergraduate man student will have when, in a few years, he is no longer an undergraduate or student but a man of thirty-five. At age thirty-five the American male is at the mid-point of his normal life span—barring such major catastrophes as a nuclear war. He has been out of college roughly as many years as he spent in formal schooling before he got his bachelor's degree. He is at the beginning of his most productive period. In terms of his working life he is still "young." Of the four decades or more which are the full working life of an American male today—from his early twenties to his mid-sixties—only the first fourth has passed. But this thirty-five-year-old is no longer a young man. He is no longer pure promise. He has reached the age of performance. He is normally well-started toward raising his family. In his own work he has usually found his niche and his career pattern. In fact he normally has also found his range—if he does not know how far he is likely to go, his colleagues and his superiors have a pretty good idea (and so, normally, has that sharp-eyed observer, his wife).

In other words by the time the college graduate has reached thirty-five, he himself should be in a position to appraise what education he has received, what it does for him, and what he needs. And he should, by that age, have put to work whatever he may have learned in school and in college. Of course every single one of these college graduates is an individual, a person. It makes no sense therefore to talk of "averages." Education, like all true experiences, is individual, personal. And both the needs of the individual and the meaning of his educational experience will and should vary from person to person.

A New Kind of Privileged Group

Yet there are some meaningful general things to be said about this American thirty-five-year-old man who has received a college education. He belongs to the first privileged majority in history. The first group that is affluent, that has abundance of opportunity and choice and at the same time represents not a tiny minority in an ocean of uneducated, underprivileged, poor people, a group that is not confined to a few, mostly hereditary and menial, occupations, but that in great measure constitutes the nation itself. Of course this situation is true only within our national boundaries or perhaps within that one-third of the world's population which lives in industrially developed countries and is, with the exception of the Japanese, all whites. With respect to the great mass of humanity, our affluent and educated majority is still as it always has been, a small privileged minority, set apart in the most dangerous fashion, mainly by their skin color. As with every member of any privileged group, the American college graduate has therefore true responsibilities, and so has the university which bestows on him the privilege that goes in our world with high education. That the privileged group is a majority actually makes the responsibility greater and more stringent.

The great majority of these thirty-five-year-old men with college degrees will work with and through knowledge rather than with their hands. They will put to work concepts rather than skills, analysis rather than imagination. Their contact with the world and with work will be largely through verbal symbols of one kind or another, whether these symbols be words or figures. They will use, therefore, only a very small part of the range of experience available to man—and all of it will be experience at one remove from the concrete reality and from the direct concern with and work on the concrete, tangible, immediate world of things and sense impressions.

The great majority of these men will work as employees in fairly large organizations: a government office or the modern school and university, a business or a labor union, a research lab or one of the armed services. They will, of necessity, be highly specialized in their own work. For it is the very purpose of the large organization to create the capacity for extraordinary results by bringing together in one joint effort people capable of superior attainment because they specialize in one small area. Yet whether a specialist is productive or not will depend in almost all cases on the capacity of other people to use his output in their work. By itself—which, of course, is the nature of specialization—all the specialist can produce is a useless fragment. Only in and through the work of others can it become a productive whole and produce results. Others therefore must be able to use whatever it is the individual in the organization turns out. Particularly pertinent is that the "product" of this individual specialist is unlikely to be a piece of stuff; it is in one form or another conceptual and theoretical. It is a piece, a fragmented piece, of information, which only by being put together with other similar pieces becomes knowledge. No matter how successful the individual will be, he will still remain within an organization—that is, within a necessarily hierarchical institution in which even the man at the top is not his own boss but the captive of the organization (and the man at the top is perhaps even less independent than the man some place further down who has to worry about only himself and his own work).

At the same time, the organization to which the individual belongs today is a partial organization, and by no means a true society. Above all, the family and the home are outside. For the first time in history a great majority of people live in a sharp cleavage between family and work. The family is neither part of the work team nor related to the work. The home is a place to go to after work rather than, as in farm or workshop, part and parcel of the working environment. In fact, the work in the modern organization is meaningless and inaccessible to the members of the family. Life in and with the family, therefore, becomes something separate and apart from work and livelihood. Education has, then, to provide the foundation for that part of life that is outside of work and organization as well as for the job itself.

The greatest change in a man's work life today, however, is that the man of thirty-five is most unlikely to apply to his job what he learned specifically only a dozen years ago. In all likelihood he has had to relearn quite a few things since then and has had to un-learn quite a few things he learned in school. It used to be gospel truth that what one had learned as a young man sufficed for the rest of one's life—whether one worked as a farmer, as a craftsman, or as a professional. There were differences in the length of apprenticeship and in the structure of the apprentice training. But once the apprenticeship was over, one had learned enough. In fact historically we have always made a sharp distinction between the world of learning and the world of work. When working began, learning stopped.

Today, regardless of one's work, learning has not stopped with the end of schooling. Learning then begins in many ways. And it is not just application of what one has learned that one has to acquire. It is increasingly new things—new concepts, new skills, new tools, new knowledge, and so on. Nor is the learning process over by the time a man reaches thirty-five. On the contrary: the more effective and successful he is in his work, the more new and different things will he have to learn, the more often will his job, his work, indeed in many cases his sphere and scope of action change. This change in the range and scope of new kinds of learning is perhaps the most novel condition of man today—and perhaps, too, is the one truly distinct property of the "Educated Society."

I have not said anything new or startling—I did not intend to. But the implications of these fairly trite observations are startling indeed—for the university as well as for the educated man, who is the university's product.

A Need for Some New Commitments and Some New Approaches

First the "Educated Society" is going to demand new commitments from both man and university. It will ask a commitment to continuing education on the part of the university and of its graduates. And it will have to become standard practice for the highly educated to return again and again to school to learn. Furthermore, a different and much more demanding responsibility will be required from both educator and educated. Responsibility to and for knowledge was sufficient in the past. In an "Educated Society" there is need for responsibility for the application of knowledge. In the past the men of knowledge were a small minority, and power was not in their hands. "The pen is mightier than the sword" is a sentiment that might be called the opiate of the intellectual —for there was usually very little truth to it. But today knowledge is a central resource. And the basic decisions are increasingly being made on and through knowledge. The university, therefore, comes into an entirely different position. It holds today central social power. Hence it must assume responsibility beyond, way beyond, the traditional "freedom to know." It must assume the self-discipline without which its power would be unbearable. It must assume responsibility not only for standards of scholarship but for standards of humility. It must assume responsibility for the usefulness of its work. And it must assume responsibility for the application of knowledge.

The educated man, for his part, must assume like responsibilities. And precisely because his is a position of privilege, the temptations and dangers of intellectual arrogance are doubly great and doubly perilous.

There is need, too, for a new commitment to the education of the whole human being. In his work the individual uses only a small portion of his total capacity—that small portion which is his reasoning mind or that even smaller part, his analytical faculty. But reason and analysis by themselves make for a lean life. In addition the educated man has to be prepared for the demands of his personal life which, increasingly, are separate from and outside his work.

There is a horrible example in history of what might easily be the fate of the "Educated Society" unless the university commits itself to educating the whole man. That example is the destruction of one of the world's greatest and most creative civilizations—the China of the T'ang and Sung periods—by the imposition of a purely verbal, purely intellectual, purely reasoning education on man in society: the Confucian canon. Within a century this commitment to the purely intellectual in man destroyed what had been the world's leader in art as well as in science, in technology as well as in philosophy. We in the Western world are today in a similar danger—for we too tend, under the impact of the triumphs of organization and of the analytical mind, to downgrade everything that is experience, everything that is performance, everything that is direct, immediate, and above all not verbal.

There is a particular need to give direct experience of performance to people who spend most of their formative years in learning. For in school there is no performance; there is only promise. We will have to build into the process of formal education direct performing experience in the arts as well as in technology—not just "art appreciation," or "history of music," or "engineering science." We must never forget that the great evolutionary mark of man is not his brain. It is his hand; the brain evolved in response to the demands and capacities of that totally unique human gift, the hand. We must not allow ourselves to let that 80 per cent of man that is not verbal intelligence but capacity to do, capacity to create, capacity to sense wither away out of sheer intellectual arrogance. Our society could not survive this kind of deformity, nor could the individual.

A second demand the "Educated Society" needs to make upon itself is a demand for new approaches to the content and aims of formal education. We as members of such a society and teachers or administrators in it will have to learn to build into every subject taught and especially into the highly advanced scientific and specialized subjects, commitment to communicate intelligibly to the "layman."

Almost everybody in this society of ours is a specialist of some sort, be he biochemist or cost accountant. Almost everybody therefore speaks his own language and uses his own jargon. But no one in this society, least of all the great majority who work in large organizations, is productive in and within his own specialty alone. Everyone depends on somebody else, who necessarily is a "layman" in all areas except his own specialty, to make his output truly effective, to convert his information into knowledge, to turn his efforts into results. Everyone, therefore, is dependent on being understood by a great many "laymen" who themselves are specialists in their own areas.

There is a good deal of emphasis today on teaching "communication skills." It is not a term I would ever use. For it implies that communication is something separate and distinct from one's work. The important thing to get across, however, today is that it is the job of the man of knowledge to make himself understood—otherwise he does not produce "knowledge," but at best "information." Our present tendency to separate "communications" from the work itself simply makes understanding impossible. It is barbarous. For civilized people, especially civilized people of high knowledge, have always taken responsibility for making their work understood. To do otherwise is treason to one's own discipline and to one's own knowledge; for it renders one's own discipline sterile, takes it out of the universe of knowledge, and condemns it, so to speak, to eternal imprisonment. It is a prescription for being ineffectual.

What we need is not "communication skills" but a commitment in every discipline, in every course, in every subject matter and knowledge area to taking responsibility for making ourselves understood. It is impossible for the "layman" to learn the jargon of the specialist, for everyone is a specialist himself and has his own jargon so that there are innumerable special languages about which no one, not even the most gifted linguist, could learn in a lifetime. What is needed is for the man who speaks a special language—that is, every educated man today—to work on getting across to others what they need to know to be able to use his knowledge output. Such a goal has to be built into the curriculum itself and, especially, into the way every subject is taught.

The old problem of specialist and generalist requires new thinking and new approaches. Everyone will work increasingly as a specialist. But everyone will have to work on making his specialty capable of being used by others. College curricula will, therefore, of necessity be more specialized in many ways. But they must be able to teach tomorrow's specialist how to relate his own specialty to the universe of knowledge. Otherwise the specialist will never succeed in making himself understood, and perhaps even more importantly, will not be able to keep on learning. Each specialty typically progresses by acquiring knowledge produced in another specialty and projecting on its own subject matter. Only rarely is progress in one area fueled from within. The biologist breaks through to a new dimension of understanding by applying what physicists, chemists, and statisticians have learned. Similarly the economist acquires new knowledge and power by going to school with the mathematician, the psychologist, and the anthropologist, and so on. Knowledge is truly one; and the specialties, no matter how powerfully established as academic departments, are nothing but temporary scaffolding, obscuring the full structure of knowledge while they help us to get to one part and to go to work on it and through it on knowledge as a whole. Unless one understands the interrelatedness and interdependence of specialties and the essential oneness of all knowledge, he cannot progress in a discipline. One cannot, above all, learn what will be needed tomorrow.

In other words the distinction between "specialization" and "general education" will increasingly have to be regarded as meaningless, if not as obscurantist as far as subject matter is concerned. One can, bluntly, only teach something, and that means one can only teach a small area—one can only teach "specialties." What matters is how one teaches. And increasingly educators should so teach the pure specialty as to give it a place and meaning in the universe of knowledge that will show its relationship and its ties to other areas of human experience and knowledge and its contribution to them and from them. A subject by itself is neither "liberal" nor "vocational"—in fact all subjects worth teaching or learning are both. The way a subject is presented, the way it is taught and learned decides whether there will be an increase in the human capacity to do and to learn or ossification of human capacity—whether, in other words, the result will be "knowledge" or "information."

A closely connected problem is the growing need to think through when to teach what. With "continuing education" becoming the norm, especially for the already highly educated man, the idea that any one school is "terminal" will fade. In fact the one "terminal" school we will still have around is high school. College should more and more be regarded as the first four years of a learning process rather than as the last four years. For the college-educated man should be expected to come back again—and he himself should expect to come back again and again.

There is, therefore, no need to try to cram into college or any other four years everything a person needs to learn in the course of his life. Rather, teachers and administrators should look upon what is taught with the question: When is it most easily learned and most usefully learned?

The concept of non-terminal education is particularly important in all the areas where there is any attempt to teach a practice: medicine and the law, business or engineering. In these areas a great many of the most important things cannot really be learned except against a background of experience. Attempts to bring these things to young men without practice experience may have been justified when there was the assumption that the college and university years were the "terminal" schooling of the future physician and lawyer, businessman, and engineer. And even though a great deal of ingenuity has been expended in providing a kind of substitute experience (e.g., through the case system especially in the business school and, much more successfully, through the clinical teaching of the medical school), the results are not too impressive. But now there is an alternative: these areas—for instance, in my own field, the attempt to teach business policy or management—can now be taught when the students have had enough experience to make these subjects meaningful to them; that is, when, on the one hand, they have enough experience to reflect upon, and, on the other, have found the need to inquire into the foundation of their work and discipline: when, in fact, their work requires conceptual thinking of a high order of abstraction.

Continuing or non-terminal education, by the way, is the only safeguard our society has against extending the years of formal schooling ad infinitum. Precisely because school, at its very best, can only test promise but cannot actually (except in the arts) give the experience of performance, one cannot mature in school. Any school is, by necessity, a preserver of adolescence. And it is dangerous and damaging to extend adolescence too long. Educators will have to work hard to make it possible for people to start work and experience as early as possible rather than to keep them in school longer and longer—especially as, increasingly, there is need for them to come back anyhow five or six years later —and then again five or six years later—to continue their education, if indeed they do not keep on studying while they work, in the evening and after hours.

The Development of a Taste for Continuing Education

Finally there is a tremendous need to build into the entire teaching and learning process, and especially into college, the ability and motivation to keep on learning. The most important thing any student can acquire in college today is not this or that knowledge or this or that skill. It is to learn how to learn—and a desire to keep on learning.

First of all, then, colleges and universities have an obligation to teach the discipline of learning: the rigor and method of analysis to bring out the need for new and different knowledge, the ability to define the knowledge needed, and the capacity to acquire new knowledge fast. These things can be learned. Every good journalist, for instance, has learned them—usually quite unsystematically of course. But they are not being taught today. And they cannot be taught if the emphasis is on learning what is already known rather than on finding out what one does not know and needs to know.

Teaching the process of learning means paying attention to creating motivation. We educators have to convey to the student the thrill and excitement of ignorance rather than the complacency of what is already known. We have to teach how one organizes ignorance—if only because there is always so much more of it around than there is of knowledge. We have to give that thrill which unfortunately so very few students ever experience, the thrill of finding something, of thinking through something, of truly learning something.

I do not pretend to know how to do many of the things that need to be done. But I do know that the old answer to them—the good teacher—is not sufficient. There is a need for so many teachers that schools cannot depend upon the "natural." Universities must make it possible for the ordinary, competent man to do the job, and to do it with a fair degree of success. And although there will be problems to face, I believe that we who teach and we who learn can look forward to very great success indeed. We now have what generations of teachers and students have been hoping for and working for: a society in which everyone has an opportunity to become educated, and in which everyone has an opportunity to make knowledge productive in his life and work. And the foundation on which we will have to build everything else is the new role and function of education: not just as "preparation" but as a "continuing education" which is part of life, part of work, and part of performance for every educated man, every college or university graduate.

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN AGE OF REVOLUTIONS

by

Max Lerner

Lerner believes that future historians may describe our times as the age of accelerated change, or the age of revolutions that shake the foundations. This paper discusses some of these revolutions to which education must make a response. First, there is technology and the revolution of pooled sovereignty which, among other things, has outmoded old concepts of national power. Former notions of a scarcity of power are rendered useless in an age of overkill. It becomes impossible to talk of American sovereignty and autonomous decisions on war and peace in the face of modern weaponry.

A second area of accelerated change is mass culture and the revolution of creative elites. The fact that we have a mass culture is not new, but there has been a revolution taking place in our elites—there has been a broadening base of elites so that we have intersecting centers of creativeness drawn from many classes instead of a single elite class. Lerner acknowledges the potential weakness in mass culture but argues that this is not necessarily destructive—we can have a cretive mass culture so long as we do not abandon the idea of elites but rather concern ourselves with the education of the more broadly based elites.

Closely related to this is the revolution of access, which is the opportunity of any youngster, regardless of birth, to develop his potentialities to the fullest. This, too, is a continuing revolution. Although the ideal of equal opportunity is part of the Declaration of Independence, it has never been completely fulfilled. The present struggle for civil rights by the Negroes represents an acceleration of the continuing drive toward our goal.

Finally, there is a values revolution. Although we have achieved material things for a large share of the American people, old value systems have broken down, and we are developing a generation without a sense of selfhood, of identity. It is a responsibility of education to help make people who act as men of thought, think as men of action, and both think and act as men of values. What is required is education that does not terminate at a particular time but consists of a continuing quest for the great questions related to a sense of identity and a concern for the whole of life.

* * *

MAX LERNER poses a problem of introduction common to vital contemporary minds. His achievement evades handy categories. To the degree that the following vocations can be distinguished one from another, he is a journalist, author, scholar, and teacher.

His recent book, AMERICA AS A CIVILIZATION (1957) received wide acclaim and has been a best-seller since its publication. His latest work is THE AGE OF OVERKILL, subtitled A PREFACE TO WORLD POLITICS (1962). Also among his titles are: EDUCATION AND A RADICAL HUMANISM, THE UNFINISHED COUNTRY, THE MIND AND FAITH OF JUSTICE HOLMES, IDEAS ARE WEAPONS, and IT IS LATER THAN YOU THINK.

He is currently Professor of American Civilization and World Politics at Brandeis University, and a journalist whose syndicated column appears widely in the United States and in many countries around the world.

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN AGE OF REVOLUTIONS

Henri Bergson, the French philosopher, when asked to read a paper at a congress of philosophers, was able only to send a message which consisted of a single sentence. The sentence read: "Act as men of thought; think as men of action." This double imperative still seems to me to apply: to act reflectively, from the context of thought; but to think in such a way that you understand the consequences of your ideas. I might add a third category here: that we must both act and think as men of values.

This is the viewpoint from which I approach the problems of education and also the problems of living in our world today, and trying to live greatly. In addition to the usual 3 R's in education, I think in terms of the "3 Know's." First, we must know our world and the forces that are loose in it, and also our own country and culture, its history, its changes and its prospects, its destinies.

Second, we must know our facts—whatever we set our hands to doing and our minds to understanding. We must know our fact not in a slovenly way, but with precision, and grasp it with imagination and with passion. As one of my heroes, Mr. Justice Holmes, put it when he addressed a class of law students, "Your business as thinkers is to see the relationship between your particular fact and the frame of the universe."

Third, we must know ourselves, and learn to make that most dangerous journey of all—the journey into the interior of our own selves, to confront what we find, to face it, and—facing it—to transform it.

I don't know what the historian of the future will call this era of ours. He may call it the era of accelerated change, since nearly everything around us is changing with an unprecedented rapidity. Perhaps he will call it the age of revolutions that shake foundations. For it is not only the face of change that counts, but also the character of the change. The very foundations of our being and of our belief are being shaken. The foundations of the world power structure, of the system of nation states, of the weaponry of war, of diplomacy, of peace-making, of ideologies, are being shaken. Wouldn't it be curious if at such a time our thought and action and belief about education were not similarly shaken? In the context of your university and some of its fresh ideas, I am happy for the chance to think through with you some of the things that are happening in the realm of higher education.

The Oakland idea that education is a continuing process that doesn't end with the four years of college, needs to be approached within the context of the larger world. There are continuing revolutions going on in our world and in our American civilization. There are continuing crises that our decision-makers face, and continuing identity crises that have to be faced in our personal disciplines by each one of us. Since all of those are continuing, my first and most obvious proposition is that our educational revolution had better be continuous also. It seems so obvious that one feels almost ashamed to say it. Yet, as Mr. Justice Holmes used to say, it is dangerous to ignore the obvious, for there often lies the deepest truth. Let me repeat that I find in the global situation and in our own American civilization a series of continuing revolutions and of continuing crises which stretch into the indefinite future. In our own personal histories we face a series of continuing identity crises, not just in adolescence or young manhood or womanhood, but in the rest of our lives.

I want to deal with a few of these continuities at greater length. But first let me comment on the concept of a continuing revolution. Many people are afraid of the term revolution, but we must not forget the age of Thomas Jefferson, a period in which a remarkable elite from Virginia, Massachusetts, and other states laid the foundation of our nation and of our thinking. They did it within the climate of opinion in which a revolutionary affirmation was the first affirmation. The whole history of America may be seen in terms of the extent to which we continued along the lines of that affirmation or retreated from it. I regard the revolutionary tradition in America as the truly authentic revolutionary tradition of the world. I do not regard the Communist revolutions as similarly authentic. Ours have been revolutions of consent, not just revolutions of a small elite group imposed on the rest of the people, but revolutions in which the people and the elite groups have acted out a dialogue, and out of that interaction American history has been fashioned.

Technology and the Revolution of Pooled Sovereignty

Let me suggest a few of the contemporary revolutions to which education will have to make a response. One is the revolution in technology, of which the weapons revolution is one phase. In my recent book, The

Age of Overkill, I tried to deal with the weaponry revolution and its implications. I used the term which I took from the Pentagon people, "the overkill factor," the number of times over that any given weapon can destroy its target. Of course we all know that with the weapons at our command we can overdestroy the Russian or Chinese target many times, and that their weapons and ours can overdestroy humanity as a target. We know about overkill, but many of us have not tried to understand the implications of this knowledge.

One of the implications has been to shake the foundations of our political thinking about the world of nation states. It has shaken the concept of power, for power is no longer what it was for centuries. In the time of Machiavelli, the underlying assumption was that of a scarcity of power. As chief of state you could never have enough power, you had to pile power on power, until you finally came to the showdown of war. If you didn't have enough power, you joined with other chiefs of state in an alliance system. The great fact in politics was the scarcity of power, very much as in economics the great fact was the scarcity of wealth. Just as there has been a classical economics, so there has been a classical politics. Yet today we have so much power that we don't dare use it. The Russians don't dare use it, as witness the Cuban missile confrontation of October 1962—nor do we dare use it. Which means, of course, that power is no longer scarce; it has become surplus. The great fact about power today is that between nation states of the first order, between the Great Powers, power has become surplus power.

The problem is how not to use the extra power we have. We can't stop making the weapons until we achieve a meeting of minds with the other camp, but we can't use the weapons either. We have to devise ways to stop making weapons on both sides, and ways of not using those that have been made. Here we are posed a problem that can concern all of us for the rest of our lives. It also wipes away the concept of national sovereignty as an absolute autonomous concept. How can any one of us talk of American national sovereignty and decision-making on war and peace as an absolute autonomous thing, when a wrong decision may mean that all of us end up as a mound of radiated ashes or as a totalitarian ant colony? Such problems will not be resolved easily, but they furnish the goal toward which much of our educational thinking and action must be directed.

We as a nation cannot make these decisions alone, nor can any other nation. I remember a conversation with Wendell Willkie just before he died, and after the explosion at Alamogordo. "Sovereignty," he said "is not something to be hoarded; it is something to be spent." This is true of everything important in life. It is true of love between parents and children, between husband and wife, of affection between intimate friends. Whoever tries to hoard love and affection, and doles it out in terms of quid pro quo, ends up loveless and unloved. But he who spends it generously finds in the end that he has more left than he started with. This truth pertains to sovereignty as well. If we say, "Let's get the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States," if we say "What have we to do with foreign aid?," or "What have we got to do with the French, or British, or the Common Market?," if we in the world today try to think in terms of decisions made by one nation, we will find that there won't be much sovereignty left.

Winston Churchill, in spite of his intense nationalism, offered the French not an alliance but a fusion of the two nations. He was the first in Europe after the war to speak of the United States of Europe, and he was one of the first to speak of the Atlantic community between western Europe and America. He understood, both in war and in peace, that we were scrambled together as sovereignties. The fact about sovereignty in our world is scrambled sovereignty, not absolute autonomous sovereignty. I prefer calling it pooled sovereignty. One of the things we Americans shall have to understand as we continue our education, in college and out, is that we shall have to learn the arts of pooling our sovereignty with the sovereignties of other nations, spending enough of it, committing ourselves to decisions by a group of nations together, as the nations in the European Common Market have done. We shall have to discover the arts of pooled sovereignty, the arts of viability, so that ultimately we may be able to develop a world collective will, some kind of world policing force, and a way to survive as a people.

Note that I have talked of some of the kinds of change taking place today in terms of some of the consequences flowing from the weapons segment of one revolution—the revolution of technology. If the consequences of one segment of one revolution are so far-reaching, one gets a perspective of the consequences of other revolutions. I often have students say to me, "What does this mean for the future? Are you an optimist or a pessimist about whether we are going to be viable?" The only answer I can give to them is, "What do you think this is, Wall Street? Do you think it's a question as to whether I am bullish or bearish about the market?" It is not in our stars but in ourselves that we fashion our future. I am neither an optimist nor a pessimist. I am a possiblist. I believe that certain things are possible. In this revolutionary context one of the targets of the educational process has to be to learn the arts of possibility, to stretch the possible to the utmost. And to do it always with an understanding of how tough-fibered is the nature of reality.

Never in world history has the visage of potential destructiveness in the world been as ugly as it now is. This is neither a graceful nor gracious world that we live in. Yet we have not recognized the reality principle operative in it. William James used to say the important distinction between people is not between Liberals and Conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, rich or poor, white or colored, Jew or Christian, Protestant or Catholic. The question is whether a person is tough-minded or tender-minded. The tough-minded person is one who recognizes the reality. The tender-minded person is the person who turns his eyes away. He sees not the reality but the picture of it inside of his own head, in order to console himself. This unreal picturing of reality is a little like the Greek myth of the Gorgon-head, a coil of wild serpents so terrible to behold that when you looked at it you turned into stone. The world around us is a Gorgon-head. Many of us recoil from it, lest we turn into stone. But we must confront it.

Mass Culture and the Revolutions of Creative Elites

Let me turn to our own civilization. In writing my book on American civilization, which took a decade or so, I found that toward the end of it many of the things I had written in the beginning of that period were no longer true. The America about which I was writing during that decade was changing under my fingers. If I were writing that book afresh now, it would have a rather different emphasis, mainly because the revolutionary changes have been in different areas and different directions.

There has been a revolution taking place in our elites. There has been a broadening of the base of the elites: they are no longer drawn from what Fisher Ames used to call long ago "the wise, the rich and the good." They are drawn from many classes now. Many youngsters who are storming the gates of the colleges today come from income strata that have not been part of the elite groups in the past. We have a mass culture; we are a mass culture. If we were only a mass culture, the future would be pretty dark. If we were only a mass culture, a good deal of what goes into the educational process would be pretty irrelevant. We are also a creative culture. We are a set of intersecting clusters or circles of creativeness in a set of intersecting areas. We have the problem of doing something about the arts, about medicine and law and the other professions, about government on every level from the most local to the top level, about music, about the plastic arts, about architecture, about literature, about agriculture, about business, about trade unions. In each of these intersecting areas, the problem is how far we can push man's understanding of what faces him and his mastery of what needs to be done. Such work can only be done by relatively small numbers of people in each area. What I mean by the new elites, then, are relatively small numbers of people who are not chosen by God, or by their religious or ethnic membership, or by the wealth of their parents, but earn membership in these overlapping concentric clusters by what they are as persons and what they do in an achieving society.

Here I go back to Thomas Jefferson. In a famous letter to John Adams he said that no democracy like the American could survive unless it could develop "an aristocracy of virtue and talent." Jefferson, who hated the aristocracy of wealth and privilege and birth, still recognized that we would have to develop the aristocracies of virtue and talent—what I should myself call our creative minorities of character and ability. Carlyle used to say that the only really important question between man and man is the question, "Is there a fire burning in your belly?" If there is anything that we have learned in our American experience since 1945, it is that our survival as a people will depend on whether we can locate those creative minorities, and whether—having located them—we can recognize the little flickering flame in them and fan it into real fire.

I want to make explicit how I conceive of these creative minorities. To me there are two categories. One I call the commanding elites, the other the intellectual or creative elites. One has to do with power, the other has to do with words, ideas, symbols. Ultimately both of them deal with symbols. They don't exclude each other. John F. Kennedy, for example, belonged to both. With a grandfather in politics and a father in both politics and business, he came out of a tradition of power; but at the same time he had made himself into a member of the intellectual elite: and so he stood with one foot in each of these elites. One reason why he was effective was that by understanding each of these elites, he was able to bring them together.

One of the imperatives for the democratic future of our country is that these elites should not hate and despise each other. If they do, we shall get a species of estrangement between the groups upon whom the future depends. There is an interesting essay by George Orwell in a volume called England Your England—the title essay—in which he addresses himself to the young intellectual generation of the 1920's and the early 1930's. He says in effect: "It was you who brought on Hitler's challenge because it was you who despised and ridiculed the members of the governing groups, and it was you who made pacifism so fashionable. It was you who broke the sense of commitment that young people might have had to their society and their culture. Thus it was you who created the vacuum into which Hitler's attack moved."

There is a degree of truth in Orwell's words, and we shall have to learn not only the importance of the elites but the importance of their hospitality to each other. I do not mean that they must not be critical of each other and must not struggle with each other in a healthy rivalry. But I do mean that they must not read each other out of the contest.

In the development of creative minorities, I must emphasize the importance of not breaking the roots that tie us to the soil from which the creative elites come. We are, I have said, a mass culture, and many if not most of those who will be taking their place in the commanding and creative elites of the future will be coming from the mass of people. They may come from lower income families where none have gone to college before them, from families without books, families where the life of the mind does not have recognition. As these new elites strive to move up and away from their past, there is a temptation to tear up the roots lodged in the soil of the people from which they come. This is a temptation that must be resisted. A recent British book on the "meritaucracy" points out the extent to which a set of elites, based purely upon merit, may not only over-emphasize the purely intellectual, but lead to an uprooting and disintegration of the ethos of the creative groups. Eugene Debs used to say, "I hope that when I rise it will be with my people, not from them." There is a strength in these roots, which is important in the development of the individual, and important also in what he can contribute to his country and his culture.

There can be no authentic creativeness in the culture unless elites arise who can train themselves for the complex technical and intellectual tasks ahead. Sometimes people call me "elitist" because I talk in these terms. In my first book, It Is Later Than You Think, A Need for A Militant Democracy, I had a chapter on the need for great leadership. I said that our democracy would not survive unless it could develop really great and militant leadership. Some of the reviewers said, in effect: "Leadership is the Fuhrer-Prinzip. The leadership principle comes out of the Nazi idea. You're talking Facism." My answer then and now is that if we abandon the idea of the elites to the non-democratic societies, we're through. Our task is to learn the conditions under which these elites can fulfill the potentials of democracy and not destroy them.

While I recognize the existence of the mass culture, my bias toward a creative America rather than a mass culture America, is obvious. I suppose I have written in more affirmative terms about our mass culture than most of my colleagues. Yet I also recognize what is crucially weak and destructive about some of its elements. It is not only the principle of trying to make the largest amount of money instead of thinking in terms of a democratic aesthetic. It goes beyond that. It has to do with the principle of mechanism, which is at the heart of a good deal of our mass culture.

One may illustrate it best by distinguishing between the movies and television. In the case of the movies one sells a product to an audience, and the audience learns to discriminate between products. In television one sells the audience to the sponsor, and the larger the audience the more the sponsor gets. The Nielson ratings throw the television network executives into a panic when they change by one fourth to one half of a point. One tries to sell as large an audience as he can, on the principle that each head counts for one, no matter what is inside of it. This is a quantitive principle of naked mechanism. Immanuel Kant used to say, "Be a subject, not an object. Treat others as subjects, not as objects." In the principle of mechanism, in which human beings are considered replaceable parts for each other, a person is not a subject; he is an object. Certainly a purpose of continuing education is to develop a sense of oneself as a subject, and of others as subjects, and to project one's life, as it stretches ahead, in terms of the fulfillment of one's unique potentials. In terms of the society, a purpose of continuing education is to develop to the full the image of a society of many diverse individuals, a richly diverse society in which each individual is a subject.

There is another aspect of mechanism that troubles me. I described it in America as a Civilization as the problem of the neutral technicians. More and more of us are becoming technicians of one kind or another. With the automation revolution, we are becoming a nation of people who run machines, or who are involved with processes and services. If we become a nation of technicians, the most troublesome questions about a technician had better be faced. The technician is terribly good about doing a job. He needs to say, "Tell me the job that you want me to do and I'll do it. I'm neutral about the what it's for." Such a stance means washing one's hands of the ethical implications of the job to be done. The machine does not carry its own ethos with it; the machine has no ethos as such. The ethos has to come from us, from human beings. I call myself a radical humanist: I believe the human being is the indispensable element in every equation; I am a radical in the sense that I think the human being is at the root of every problem. I test every measure, every set of ideas, by what it does for the human being. Since the machine does not carry its ethos with it, the ethos has to come from the human being. The technician will have to answer the question of the cui bono, the "what for?", the "to what good?", the "what will come out of this?" We cannot do much basic thinking about education unless we keep coming back always to the question of ethos in the educational process.

Access: A Continuing American Revolution

The next revolution I want to talk about has to do with access. Let me first explain the term. Not too long ago I visited Warsaw, where I had an interesting time with a number of artists, editors, professors. One evening a group was brought together for me, and the chairman got up and said, "Mr. Lerner, we know you have written a big book on America as a Civilization. Could you tell us in a single word what is the essence of American civilization?" I thought hard and fast: what is America? Is it freedom, is it equality, is it democracy, is it tolerance, is it decency, is it dynamism? Suddenly I heard myself say "access." You see, we have a Declaration of Independence which says that all men are born free and equal. I hope we are born free and will remain free. But we are not born equal. We are born with unequal abilities and unequal potentials. They have nothing to do with income, religion, race, or color, but they have to do with the individual. Every army commander knows it, every employer, every teacher, every parent knows it. But we also have the idea that there ought to be equal access to equal life chances, so that every one of our unequally born youngsters can develop his unequal abilities to the full.

It is in these terms that access is the heart of the American experience. I consider the whole Civil Rights struggle—the effort to get equal access to equal life chances—as one phase of the access revolution in the United States. No one of us has to make up his mind about whether he likes the groups who are trying to get equal access, or what he may think about their traits. The access revolution has nothing to do with groups as a category. It has to do with the individual and with what his potentials are.

I was born in Russia and was brought here by my parents, with a little brood of brothers and sisters, back in 1907, when I was four years old. Our family was part of a vast wave of immigration that was sweeping into America from all parts of the world. That decade marked the crest of the wave. From every corner of the world these immigrant families came, each carrying its own particular freightage of memories and tragedies, traditions, values. Why did my parents come here? They didn't come here to get rich, although there was a legend at that time among the immigrants that the paving stones of America were made of gold. They came so that their children would have an equal chance at life's chances. May I say that I've had it, and my children are having it. I won't be content until every other American youngster has had that chance.

To me, keeping open the opportunities for equal chances is part of the task of continuing education. What counts in education is not just what content goes into it, or how many classes, or how many years. What counts also is what John Dewey used to call equality of concern—the equality of concern for all young people, no matter what the accidents of their birth. I think we are beginning to carry that concern out. I don't often get angry, but I do get angry when I find doors of opportunity open to some youngsters and slammed shut in the faces of others. I get angry when I find scars on the hearts of some that others can escape, when I find obstacles on the paths of some that don't exist for others.

Sometimes people say to me that these things may be tragic, but that is how things are. The only answer I can give is that we must not demean the concept of tragedy. Every one of us will have to face tragedy. The difference between people is that tragedy destroys some while it deepens others. No person and no nation can escape it. Tragedy is part of the very constitution of the Universe. But there is another concept, that of pathos, which is different from tragedy. The pathetic is man-made, and because it is man-made it can be man-resolved. Poverty is not tragic, it is pathetic. Slums are not tragic, they are pathetic. Segregation is not tragic, it is pathetic. Alcoholism, drug addiction, the violence that is sweeping our country, these are not tragic: they are pathetic. War itself is not tragic, it is pathetic. Being man-made, the pathetic can be man-resolved.

If I understand what President Lyndon Johnson is talking about when he talks of the Great Society, it is the national effort, by an act of collective will and intelligence, to remove the element of the pathetic from our society. There will still be the tragic. And there will still be the task of developing greatness in men and nations. Although I speak of revolutionary change, and although I think of myself as part of the whole American revolutionary tradition, I am also aware that what ultimately counts is greatness. Greatness in a nation and in its people goes beyond particular welfare measures and particular attitudes about change, all of which are necessary in order to clear the ground for greatness. But greatness itself is something else.

I believe there are potentials for greatness—moments of possible greatness—in every human being, in every group, in every community, that there is heroism in every people. I happen to believe also that what counts is what a people do with the human material as well as with natural resources and the economic wealth and the power of their civilization; that the human material can give meaning to the whole civilization process. Part of the task of the educational process is to help the individual and the nation toward whatever moments and potentials of greatness in life there may be. What education is about is not just a vocation and its skills, not just a job, not just making a living. What education is about is making a life and a personality, fashioning a character, exploring the depths of the tragic and the heights of joys. What education is about is the chance to build a Great Society, of which welfarism is only the first step, but certainly by no means the last.

Values: The Need To Educate the Whole Personality

I come now to the values revolution. While we have done well on technology, on national income, and on total national product, while we have taken great leaps in national power, we have not taken a leap in the basic quality of our society. I am talking now of the violence pervasive throughout America today—the violence in the angry classroom, in the subways, in the urban streets, in the suburbs.

I am deeply concerned about the fact that the old structure of the family has broken down—the family which used to be a producing as well as a consuming unit, where a son could grow up seeing his father at work, taking pride in him, identifying with him. Production has been cut away from the family. The principle of authority in the family has diminished. Not only has the father become an absentee father, who comes home at the end of the day or for the weekend, but the authority principle of the father has diminished. I am talking now of the crumbling emotional structure of the family. I am talking of children growing up in loveless families, where there is little chance to form images of the possibility of love or of an affectional life. How do we expect our children to get a sense of selfhood, of identity, if they have not first had the necessary identification with the image of a manly man, a womanly woman, a life with meaning?

This is the darker phase of the moon, of course. But I am underscoring it for perspective. Educationally, we find ourselves today in a situation where we seem to have everything. We have students. They are crowding into the colleges and the universities as never before. They are coming from the strata of society that college students never came from before. We have graduate schools, which are turning out our teachers. We have campuses; we have college buildings going up. We have good teachers, and good teaching machines, and audio-visual aids. We have enormous, enormous richness in all these things. At the same time we also find that the quality of life which these young people live and are likely to live in is not superior, and may in many ways not be as good as before. Our figures on mental health are shattering to anyone who takes time to contemplate their meaning. In this kind of educational situation, what is the crux of the matter? The crux of the matter is: What is the ethos that will inform the educational process?

One answer has to do with the ethos that the teachers bring to the tasks of teaching and learning. What the teacher teaches is himself. As someone said, education is what remains in the mind after everything that you have been taught has been forgotten. As I look back at my own learning process what still stays in my mind is a couple of teachers—how they looked, how they stood, how they walked, their "grace under pressure," in Hemingway's description of courage—a certain stance toward life, a gallantry. What stayed with me was the fact that they were not made of sawdust stuffing, that they stood up in crises, that they spoke out, that they linked themselves with meaningful things in life, that they were absorbed with what they were doing. Students learn from a kind of incandescence which such teachers have.

At my own university, at Brandeis, the most effective course we have had has been one where, for over a period of 8 to 10 years, we brought a succession of men and women to the campus, one every two weeks, not to talk about issues or problems but about themselves—their lives and careers, about the decisions they had to make, their failures, their despairs. We never had any problems about motivation with the students in this course—hundreds of them flocked to get into these meetings because they identified themselves with living human beings who had made their mark. It was not the success that prompted the students to identify themselves with these people, but the working image of someone who had given himself to something and had therefore found something. I am suggesting that the process of education had better not exclude this kind of incandescent image between teacher and student, and between the student and people out in some field, whatever it might be, in which the student might later be working.

What really will count in your education and in life has to do with the whole personality, with every aspect of your selfhood. This total personality doesn't stop at any point. It goes on, after the college years; it goes on when you have got your job, when you have courted and won your girl, when you have had your children, and when you have had all of the headaches that come with the girl and the children, all the heartbreak that comes when the job ceases to have much meaning and becomes a form of dust and ashes. It goes on when you look at yourself in the mirror sometime in middle age and feel like slitting your throat. These are the points at which education is tested.

Education: A Continuing Search for Values

I am happy to be talking with you at a university which I venture to call an open-ended university. At Oakland it is not necessary to argue that there is a connection between these revolutions and continuing education. Oakland considers education to be open-ended: it doesn't terminate at the end of a particular period of time. It goes on, and one of the obligations of the university is to go on trying to organize the continuation.

There is a story about Gertrude Stein, the talented, somewhat eccentric American writer. She lived most of her life in Paris. On her death bed, she turned to her friend Alice Toklas, and she said, "Alice, what's the answer?" Alice looked at her sadly, and she said, "Gertrude, we don't know." Then with her dying breath Gertrude said, "Well then, Alice, what's the question?" Education concerns itself not with the answers but with questions. The test of a society is whether great questions are asked in it.

Lenin used to say that in a Communist society the question is kto kvo—Who Whom? Who rules whom, who pursues whom, who sends whom to Siberia, who survives whom. It's a question of the political jungle. What is the question in our society? I mean not the questions we teach and preach overtly, but the covert questions that we live. It has been suggested that the questions are "Who gets what? What's in it for me?"

There is a street in New York called the Avenue of the Americas. There are still some stores left there which sell signs inscribed with rather quaint mottoes. I remember going past one of these stores, and one of these signs caught my attention because it posed a rather curious question: "If you're so smart, why aren't you rich?" I stood there studying it for a long time. I couldn't answer it and I walked away in disgust, but after a few blocks I came back. I was like a chicken fascinated by a snake. I had to answer that one. I thought and thought and finally with a sigh of relief I walked away. The answer was that it was the wrong question. We ask too many wrong questions in our educational process and in our society. "Are you a success?" "Have you got power?" "Have you got security?" "Have you got status?" "Are you having fun?" And I suggest that these are the wrong questions. There are some right questions. "Do you care about your work—your work, not your job?" That is the meaningful question. Are you capable for your work? Have you got the commitment for it? Are you capable of genuine play, not fun, but play, something that exercises all of the faculties of body and mind and spirit. Can you face tragedy? Can you face failure? Can you make the journey into the interior? Can you face what you'll find there? Can you take risks? Are you capable of involvements? Have you got a sense of the human connection so that what happens to others happens also to you? Do you have a feeling for the whole sensuous universe, of the carpet of the earth and the tent of the sky and the whole world of sight and sound and color? These are some of the questions that can be asked in our society, and only a great educational process will be able to really propose them, and only a great society will be able to organize them. If we can ask some of these questions, then I think perhaps our young people will become convinced that they can stretch out their hands to claim the future. If we don't, then perhaps what Adlai Stevenson said will prove true: "There will be other and bloodier hands than ours to stretch out to that future to claim it."

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN AGE OF ANXIETY

by

Rollo May

Rollo May argues that in our increasingly mechanized world the technical gains are so great we face the danger of being engulfed by the very tools we have created. This engulfment is reflected in our mass communications, in our intellectual concern for the manipulation of people and nature, and in education with its emphasis on the mastery of external facts. Psychologically, it is expressed as a struggle to preserve our identity as persons, to resist validation of the self in terms of productivity or other external criteria. Our very survival hinges on the ability of the human conscience to transcend its tools, to recognize that we must shift our concern from power over men, over nature to power with men, with nature.

A central problem beneath these issues is anxiety. People surrender their identity because they are afraid of freedom and of the anxiety that goes with freedom. Rollo May distinguishes between normal anxiety, which stimulates creative activity, and neurotic anxiety, which is destructive in that it renders the individual incapable of action. To the extent that normal anxiety is allayed by the machine or by tranquilizers, we develop apathy, lose zest and our sense of values. Neurotic anxiety is the long term result of unfaced normal anxiety. Thus, the answer must not be the tranquilizing mood but an attempt to shift anxiety to a constructive form—or in other words to identify what we are afraid of and therefore to know how to deal with the threat. Ultimately May believes a person can withstand anxiety to the extent that his values are stronger than the threat. The emphasis must be placed not on a set of substantive values, but on value as a verb—it is the act of valuing which is the route to the salvation of humanity.

Theoretically education should be concerned with the expansion of the mind and thus the preservation of one's identity. Actually the opposite is more likely in what passes for education today. Communication is separated from the work of art or the idea itself. Learning is lost in the acquisition of externalized facts. The compulsion to acquire facts kills the spirit of adventure and eliminates the "I" experience of enjoying a great idea or a great work. Potentially, continuing education is parallel to psychotherapy in that it is an expansion of the consciousness by virtue of enlarging the image of reality possessed by the self. Continuing education should be the context in which this search for identity can be made.

* * *

ROLLO MAY began his psychotherapeutic studies in Vienna and completed his doctorate in psychology and his psychoanalytic training in New York City, where he presently holds his practice. Presently May serves as Supervisory and Training Analyst for the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Psychoanalysis, Adjunct Professor of Clinical Psychology at New York University, Lecturer at the New School of Social Research, and Fellow of the National Council of Religion in Higher Education. Two of his most widely acclaimed publications are THE MEANING OF ANXIETY and MAN'S SEARCH FOR HIMSELF.

THE UNIVERSITY IN AN AGE OF ANXIETY

I am glad to have an opportunity to discuss a problem that has been very close to my own heart and my thinking for a number of years. This is the problem of how to preserve our identity as original selves in a world in which technology has become not only the method by which everything is done but also the God for which things are done. Our technological progress has come to the point where the existence of our individual selves as students and as faculty members, as thinkers in our twentieth-century world, is severely threatened. I believe that education should be the expansion of man's mind, the expansion of his consciousness; and this expansion ought to increase the experience of identity of the self. But education in our age very often does exactly the opposite: it undermines the experience of the self. Unfortunately, as I will indicate later in my discussion, it seems the more one piles on the degrees, the more one masters the external facts in education, the more one tends to lose his experience of identity as a person.

In the last century when they strung the telegraph wire from Maine to Texas and there was much celebration in the newspapers, Henry Thoreau asked a pertinent question, "Does nobody ask,—do the people of Maine have anything to say to the people of Texas?" Thoreau went on to say that our danger is that we shall become the tools of our tools. This, I think, is the central paradox and crisis of modern life. Our technical gains are so great in the middle of the twentieth century that there is the danger that we become the tool of the very tools we have fashioned.

Television is a good example of the danger. TV is certainly a boon for mass communication and the spread of arts; but the problem is that more and more the human beings who sit in front of the TV set become passive recipients of a communication that by the very fact of its being geared to 10 million listeners becomes robbed of its originality and the essence of art that makes a program worth watching. In other words, the inescapable effect of mass communication and the tremendous spread of technology that is related to it leads to what Peter Drucker described as the separation of communication from the work of art itself, and once communication is separated from the essence of the spirit of consciousness that produced the work or experience, at that point the art is undermined and the significance of the idea—that is, its originality and its imaginative quality—is automatically undermined.

I think this tendency is inherent in mass communication and other technological developments. The machine always holds the threat of becoming our master. We shall become the tool of our tools unless human consciousness—unless the human spirit—is able to find and develop itself sufficiently to give meaning to the vast structure that is formed by the machine. Robert Hutchins says that we may, as a race, lose the capacity to read. Newspapers are folding up in New York and, I believe, around the rest of the country as well. Now when you read you have to participate actively in what you are reading; you have to put yourself into it. When you watch TV, you don't have to. The issue that underlies this is the cultivation of passivity and of a lack of full consciousness in the individual who participates in these passive forms of communication.

My brother, who is a physician, said yesterday evening as he and I were talking about these problems, that in his judgment the human brain does not become senile neurologically, but becomes senile when the person has lost his zest, his values, and his commitment to life. His theory fits what I as psychologist know about human beings. They become old in mind and consciousness not when they've lived a certain number of years, but when life no longer has challenge, or zest, or values which they can commit themselves to. The human mind grows atrophied rather than old. Another way of saying the same thing is to say that apathy sets in when passivity becomes the mode of our mental relationship to the world. Then our brains themselves deteriorate, and the loss of identity of ourselves as persons goes hand in hand with the loss of capacity to use our intelligence.

This situation is in brief the basis for the problems I am going to discuss. How can we preserve the experience of our own identity, how can we meet the anxiety that comes with being an original self, how do we face threats to our values, and how can we do these things most constructively in our education?

Identity

I think we in the western world are at the end of an historical period, a period that began at the Renaissance. This period was characterized by the capacity of man, à la Bacon, to gain power over nature—a feat modern man accomplished with tremendous success with the help of the machine and mathematics. Now this historical development has come to a critical point, and we are in a stage in our civilization not only of social upheaval, characterized by wars and by radical economic and political change; we are at the point of a much deeper change, namely, what I may call an upheaval in the consciousness. If you will permit me to use terms here without their religious connotation, we are in the midst of an upheaval of the spirit of man. By spirit I mean man's capacity to commit himself to a way of life that is of his own choosing, despite the difficulties in nature or the sociological institutions around him. I see this issue as the issue of whether human consciousness is more significant than the machine that it has made. The issue is whether we can make the transition from a world historical period in which our goal was the power over nature, to one in which we use our power with nature.

This power over nature was transferred in psychology, physiology, and many other fields in the nineteenth century to power over ourselves, and we learned to manipulate ourselves the same way we manipulated our coal cars and the external nature around us. I believe our critical issue—and I think on this will hinge the capacity to control the atom bomb and in deeper ways the survival of western civilization—is whether human consciousness can transcend the tools that it has made. I am not sure whether human consciousness is capable of sufficient modesty to recognize that our power is only self-defeating unless it is power with nature rather than against nature, with our fellowmen—not against them, with our own bodies and minds rather than a power over them. The point I want to make is that students, and this includes students of all ages, lose their selves, lose their identity to the extent that they are becoming the victims of a pattern of education that permeates our whole culture. And this loss of identity is the central cause of our twentieth century anxiety.

Last December I was invited to give one of the addresses at the annual meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, a conference of some 1600 presidents and deans and personnel workers of schools in the East. They assigned me the topic, "How Can We Reduce Student Anxiety and Increase Productivity." What I said to them was, "Gentlemen, I am very rude, but I must point out that the very problem that causes your trouble appears in your title. There has been an overemphasis on productivity in education; this overemphasis is a cause not only of anxiety but of loss of identity. It is the *machine which produces; man creates*. For my part I would rather see a civilization on our campuses with more opportunity for solitude rather than greater productivity. I would rather see a rediscovery of meditation, a development of attitudes that will cherish quietness and the opportunity of the student to ponder and think rather than an emphasis on never-ending productivity. Is there not plenty of evidence that you and I and our students cannot possibly keep up with the machine and its productivity anyway, particularly with the imminent emergence of cybernation and the leisure associated with it. We have had a lot of discussion about this problem lately, in the Western World, and there seems no doubt whatever that we are going to have a cybernated civilization. In a relatively short time it will be immoral to work for more than 15 hours a week. People are scared to death of the freedom, and the emptiness, and vacuity that is involved in that much leisure. The issue then will be not our productivity but our capacity to create meaning for what is produced. Now this is an inward issue. The machine will produce much more than we can. Perhaps the machine itself will prove to us that we have no other choice but to be human. Then we shall realize—and I trust we can help students in college to realize this too—that man does something of much greater import. Man can perceive significances, and this the machine can never do. Man can find meaning with his imagination—again what the machine can never do. And man can make the plans and choose the goals for the machine.

It seems to me, therefore, that one of the main things we who are educators can do to help our students and ourselves is to reconsider the process and the ends of education. The result of the emphasis on power *over* nature has been the validation of the self by external criteria. In effect there results an invalidation of the self, because validation by external criteria tends to shrink the individual's consciousness, to block off his awareness, and thus contributes not only to the loss of his identity but to the production of considerable amounts of destructive anxiety. *I propose that the aim of education should be exactly the opposite: that it should be the expansion of the consciousness*. Many times during this symposium series you have heard the phrase "continuing education." Everything I say indicates that there is no education that is not continuing education. Whatever anyone studies while in college is going to be out-of-date in a few years. But what I'm talking about is something even more important—namely, that the relationship of learning to one's own mind requires not an accumulation of things but rather requires a conviction that education, if it means anything at all, is a way of life that goes on one's whole life long. If the education is not continuing education, then something is wrong with the education. Education should help us to develop sensitivity, depth of perception, and above all the capacity to perceive significant forms in what we are studying. These capacities should continue and expand all our lives. To that extent, we shall at the same time develop in ourselves the experience of identity.

Anxiety

Next, I want to discuss a concept that I have used several times, namely anxiety. As a psychotherapist, my experience indicates that the central problem beneath these issues that we are discussing is the problem of anxiety. People lose their identities, they surrender their identities, because they are afraid of their freedom and of the anxiety that goes with freedom. To experience one's self as an identity is to be anxious. As Kierkegaard puts it, "Anxiety is the dizziness of freedom." The problem of freedom becomes a much more difficult one in our day than in earlier times because the choice between freedom and apathy is more radical. No man can any longer sit on the fence; he either has to become servile or a conformist looking at his TV and becoming more or less a robot, or he must assert a kind of freedom that will fill the leisure that he will have.

The need to make a radical choice makes us anxious, and to avoid anxiety we turn ourselves over to techniques. Tools are the substitute for the facing of anxiety in our relation to ourselves. My brother took me through the rounds of his hospital at Howell. His main purpose in going over there was to look at some X-rays of a man who had fallen and possibly broken his back. When he and I arrived at the hospital, we didn't see the man at all, but went directly to the X-ray room, and there my brother with his knowledge could look at the X-rays and tell very quickly what was wrong and what wasn't wrong. Then we went and saw the man, and my brother reassured him that his back was not broken. I said as we left the hospital, "It must relieve you of a lot of insecurity to have this technical work done for you. You simply have a look at the X-rays and know immediately where you stand." He agreed that using the X-rays was a whole lot easier than working without them, but he added, "I think that there was more satisfaction in the old way of doctoring."

Now, neither my brother nor I nor anyone else would imply that we should go back to the old ways of doctoring, or old ways of education, or anything old. Going back is not the issue at all. The issue is that we pay a price for the fact that the machine can absolve us of anxiety. We pay a price in loss of our originality and of our own satisfaction to the extent that the machine—or in my field, the tranquilizers—relieves us of the anxiety that always must go with the free human being, experiencing his own consciousness and asserting his own identity. To the extent that anxiety is allayed (I speak here of normal, constructive anxiety, not neurotic)—to the extent that this anxiety of freedom, anxiety of experiencing one's own identity, is allayed by machine or by tranquilizers, we shall, I propose, develop apathy, lose zest, lose our sense of values. Values become automatically the products of what our techniques can do for us. And when values become merely the products of techniques, there is loss not only of meaning in one's life but greater or lesser loss of one's consciousness as well.

Because I think that only by understanding the meaning of anxiety and by considering how we may deal with it can we start to solve the problems of education and modern life, let me become more scientific and define my terms. What is anxiety? If somebody in this room were to leap and cry "fire," you and I would suddenly look up, our heart beats would increase, our blood pressures would rise so that our muscles could work more efficiently and our senses would be sharpened so that we could better perceive the blaze and select a good way out. In my normal anxiety my sense is sharpened so that I can better see the corner where the blaze is, and I can pick out more sharply the door that I want to use to get out. But if, as I move toward that door, I see that it is blocked and discover that there is no way out, no exit, my emotional state becomes something quite different. My muscles become paralyzed, my senses become blurred, and my perception becomes obscured. I cannot orient myself; I feel as though I were in a bad dream; I experience panic.

Now the first state I have described is normal anxiety; it is a constructive energizing experience. The second is neurotic, destructive anxiety. Destructive anxiety consists of the shrinking of the consciousness, the blocking off of awareness; and when it is prolonged, it gives one a depersonalized feeling, an apathy. Anxiety is the losing of oneself and one's relation to the objective world. The fact that the distinction between subjectivity and objectivity is blurred is the reason one is immobilized. Anxiety is losing one's world; and since self and world are always corollaries, to lose one's world means losing oneself at the same moment.

This unconstructive state of anxiety is to a great extent the experience of our students and of many of the rest of us as well. I mean those of us who no longer go to classes but are still students of life, ourselves, and human experience. And this unconstructive anxiety creates not only the loss of the world outside, the blurring of the self, but also a loss of the sense of identity. The capacity to meet anxiety and the experience of identity go hand in hand. The prevalence of neurotic anxiety is certainly partly caused by all the external upheavals in our world, particularly atomic power and possible atomic war. One has the feeling that there is no exit in our historical situation, but there are more pervasive forces at work.

Anxiety occurs on a deeper level than that of the external sociological threat. It occurs because of a threat to values one identifies with one's existence as a self. In my example of the fire, the value that was threatened was the value of physical life. But this is not, in our technologically efficient day, very often the threat. Much more frequent is the threat of loss of social, emotional, moral values. The threat is to the values that the person identifies with himself. Students no longer have values that serve as a basis for relating to their world. Anxiety is inescapable in an age where values are in radical transition and is a pronounced cause of the apathy in students. Prolonged anxiety tends to develop into feelings of depersonalization, which is first cousin to apathy.

Now, among students, a good part of this anxiety is hooked up with getting into college and then into graduate school. I know how much of the pressure of a feeling that somebody is looking over one's shoulder there is among those who want to go on to graduate school, and how deep is the anxiety this causes and how often the inevitable pressure is that the student gives up his originality and fits some kind of external system. Parents nag and cajole their children to get the A's that are necessary. Subsequently, when students get into college, the first year is often a let-down. "Is this what for 12 years I've been knocking myself out for?" And then when students get into graduate school after knocking themselves out at least for the last three years of college, they develop a frank cynicism by and large about education and the goals of life. Arthur Jensen, Dean of Dartmouth, wrote me a letter in which he put the matter quite eloquently. He said, "Each year I can see the pressure of the requirements to get into graduate school beginning to increase. The bright lad who is content with B's in formal courses so that he can wallow in the library, can walk and watch the stars at night, the lad who has 'the courage to be,' seems more and more the one whose values divert so much from those of his fellows that he becomes the oddball. And even faculty are under the continuous pressure of their peers looking over their shoulders. They must write such and such, they must write so and so, and they are often more concerned with proving something to the professors back at Yale or Harvard than they are in teaching the students in front of them." Jensen's words illustrate the most regrettable form of anxiety in our present situation.

To some extent we all have to fit the system. It is not the system itself that I'm arguing against, since we all have to live in an objectivated world no matter what we think about it. But what I am arguing is that we find and preserve the inner devotion and commitment to the values we believe in, that despite the pressures we can still make sure we do not betray our own consciousness.

Now the student is unfortunately validated by external signs, by scores, and by technical scales. The shift of the validation to outside himself is exactly what shrinks his consciousness, is exactly what undermines his identity and develops neurotic anxiety.

What can we say about meeting this anxiety? When I spoke to the college presidents and deans in the East, I said that the topic that they proposed to me, "How to Reduce Student Anxieties," was already a destructive topic. Just as it would make little sense to give somebody a tranquilizer when there is a fire in the room in order that he can burn more painlessly, it makes no sense not to be anxious in the world in which we are living. If there is a fire in this room I want to be anxious; I need to be anxious in order to exit as efficiently as possible. To reduce anxiety (I speak of normal anxiety) is a destructive activity. Now, what is neurotic anxiety? Neurotic anxiety is only the long-term result of unfaced normal anxiety. Neurotic anxiety about women is the long-term result of the anxiety that was not faced by a man in relation to women when he was in his early years, when he became an adolescent. So I do not propose the tranquilizing mood as a solution to our problem of anxiety and consciousness. What we must do, rather, is to shift anxiety from a neurotic to a constructive form, to help the student and ourselves identify what we are genuinely afraid of, and thereby to know better what steps to take to overcome the threat. It would be irrational in our age, as I have said, not to be anxious. According to Kierkegaard, anxiety is our best teacher. Learning to know anxiety is an adventure which every man has to confront if he would not go to perdition either by not having known anxiety or by sinking under it. Kierkegaard, therefore, concludes that he who has learned rightly to be anxious has learned the most important thing.

Now since unconstructive anxiety takes over by virtue of the fact that it shrinks the consciousness of the individual, expansion of the consciousness is the fundamental way to meet anxiety. Kierkegaard here also has a wise statement: "To venture causes anxiety, but not to venture is to lose oneself."

Values

A final point that I want to make has to do with the importance of values. I said at the outset that anxiety is the reaction to the threat to values which one identifies with his existence as a self. I now want to add a corollary. A person can meet anxiety to the extent that his values are stronger than the threat. Here, I draw together the various implications I have made in this address, that basic to the prevalence of neurotic anxiety in our day, on the campuses as well as in the rest of society, is the disintegration of values in our culture. It is the student's inner experience of value that provides him with the core around which he can know himself as a person and gives him something to commit himself to. Back in my college days at Michigan State and Oberlin we students found certain values in religion to which we could commit ourselves, economic values in the new socialism, values in pacifism, values in politics. Some of my generation a few years later did actually give their lives in what they felt, and what I felt, was the last war in which there was a real distinction between right and wrong—the Spanish War. Whether you agree with that valuation on our part or not is irrelevant—at least we had a value that we could believe in. We had values in the cause of enlightenment in sex and religion and to some extent in art. Unfortunately, there aren't any values nowadays except two rather vague ones that have universal reliability and embody some feelings of care and service to the underdog as in the Peace Corps and a sense for social justice in the area of race relations.

What can we educators do, therefore, to make the climate on our campuses more nourishing to the growth of values? Certainly we can't bring back the old values, but we can help our students and ourselves to rediscover the sources of man's value choices in the accumulated wisdom of the past. We need, frankly, a new appreciation of the humanities. Dean Barzun of Columbia predicts the demise of graduate work in the humanities because he says that the humanities have become technologized along with the rest of our culture. When Dean Barzun says this we must take it seriously, though we also must take steps to withstand this trend. I propose that a new understanding of the critical importance of man's capacity to value would help rediscover the humanities, not as leisure time hobbies for indigent elderly ladies but as the very blood and sinew of our value choices which can form masses of facts into a civilization.

What is important in dealing with anxiety? It is not that we give the students the substance of values—substance and fact can change from year to year—but that we help the student learn the act of valuing. In the moment of anxiety, whether or not a person will be able to utilize the experience and grow from it depends upon his inner capacity to choose values at this time. Nietzsche expresses this point beautifully when he says, "No people can live without valuing. Valuing is creating! Hear it, ye creative ones. Without evaluation the nut of existence is hollow. Hear it, ye creative ones!"

And Nietzsche's statement points to a final suggestion, namely the matter of commitment. Anxiety is used constructively as the person is able to relate to the situation, to do his valuing, and then commit himself to the course of action, to a way of life. On campuses in this country during the decades up to the last one, I think we were committed to a policy of non-commitment. We were committed to a questioning of everything merely for the sake of questioning. I believe this situation has changed, and to the extent that it has, I am exceedingly gratified. Students now yearn (and even if this yearning is on quite submerged levels of their personalities, nevertheless it is profound) for some ultimate concerns, for some attitudes, for a way of life that they can believe in and to which they can commit themselves. I suspect that our students (and again this is on levels below what is articulated over a glass of beer or in the usual classroom) realize that the usually assumed goals of adaptation and survival are not enough, and that Aristotle was right when he said, "Not life, but the good life is to be valued." Perhaps we are moving into a time (I trust my hope is not an illusion) when teachers of all sorts will not be apologetic for committing themselves, when, like Socrates, they will question courageously because they believe more courageously.

Education

To what extent has education dealt with the issues we have been discussing here? Learning in our day, as I see it, becomes increasingly lost behind the acquisition of externalized data. Our campuses suffer under the illusion that wisdom lies in the sheer accumulation of facts, and the student piles Ossa upon Pelion in trying to get more and more facts for his research. But what with the knowledge explosion these days, in which the recording of facts geometrically increases—video abstracts, microfilms, endless cross references, with research increasing geometrically every day—the student can never catch up no matter how fast he runs. Indeed, he generally finds himself getting farther and farther behind every day. There develops then a very real and serious problem—a struggle between the necessity to devote oneself and commit oneself to the acquisition of externalized facts as over against paying attention to the needs of one's own mind and spirit. An astute social commentator, Dwight MacDonald, has put the problem this way in an essay he wrote called "The Triumph of the Fact." "Our mass culture—and a good deal of our high, or serious, culture as well—is dominated by an emphasis on data and a corresponding lack of interest in theory, by a frank admiration of the factual and an uneasy contempt for imagination, sensibility, and speculation. We are obsessed with technique, hagridden by Facts, in love with information. Our popular novelists must tell us all about the historical and professional backgrounds of their puppets; our press lords make millions by giving us this day our daily Facts; our scholars—or, more accurately, our research administrators—erect pyramids of data to cover the corpse of a stillborn idea."[1] MacDonald's emphasis upon facts, with a loss of the subjective meaning, is what I am calling the externalizing of education, which tends to undermine the experience of identity in the student. What we should be talking about is education as the expansion of consciousness that ought to go on every year, ought to go on all through life—and must go on if we are to retain not only the functioning brain but the reality of the human spirit.

In a mad, frantic acquiring of sheer facts, where is the adventure of thinking, where is the joy of stretching the mind? The student's urge to explore is lost under a compulsion to acquire. In this connection permit me to reminisce, for I cannot forget the moments in my intellectual development in college days, when a new idea swept into my ken, an idea that I couldn't forget. I remember the tremendous feeling of adventure—such as a country boy feels, perhaps, on coming into a city, where suddenly the world stretches out in a way he never dreamed it could because he simply didn't know what a great city is like. In those moments that I remember, even the trees looked different on the campus; life had a different quality and a different form. I remember down at Oberlin I had a class in Greek which meant a great deal to me. Until then I thought Homer was something that Babe Ruth knocked out so many of each summer, but at Oberlin I discovered the Greek poet and found that he wrote in a language of tremendous genius and depth. Our Greek seminar was held in a little room in the library, and in the center of the table around which we sat there was a Greek vase. I had never seen anything like it in my whole life until then. I remember gazing at that Greek vase hour after hour, and beginning to experience that there was form, there was sensitivity, there was harmony, there was depth that is called beauty by the poets and the artists whom I had never known, but whom now I could begin to take into my mind and spirit.

Something of this sort happens to all of us, perhaps not often—that is too much to expect—but once in a while; and that once is worth more to most of us than all the rest that happens during the year. Now this precious experience must not be lost under the compulsion to acquire. Fortunately, in the Greek seminar I remember, our professor knew that more important than the acquisition of learning how to conjugate Greek verbs was the fact that we sat together around Xenophon and Plato and that Greek vase. There we absorbed some new vista of consciousness from the language, from the vase, and from the community of spirit with each other. We picked up a vision of life that was to be of tremendous importance for us. Of course our teacher had faith that we would learn our verbs and our languages much better because our learning was motivated not by the desire to get a grade, but rather by the experience that here was a new world in which his students could dare explore and participate.

---

[1] Dwight MacDonald, Against the American Grain (New York: Random House, 1962), p. 393.

I believe not only that this freedom of discovery is the center of the mind and human consciousness but this openness constitutes the human spirit. If our civilization is to survive, the sense of discovery must not be lost under the compulsion to acquire facts. Education would be much simpler if acquisition were the important thing; then the premium is put on the student's mastery of externalized facts, not on seeing how he is related to the facts. It takes too much time to see how one is related to the facts. And if the facts are placed in a personal context, how is the grader to figure out whether the student knows the facts or not? If a student puts his own heart into what he is learning, he may be bringing subjective bias into the facts. No wonder many students feel it is better to keep facts and feelings separate—otherwise they will meditate too much, they will stop to muse, they will close their books in the library and walk out under the stars, and their facts will most certainly be tainted with subjectivity.

All of us to a greater or lesser degree have a desire to learn and to follow our original promptings, regardless of the external pressures. But we experience anxiety and guilt when we betray these inner promptings. A student not only finds himself on an assembly line, facing staggering quantities of data that are bound sooner or later to defeat him, but, more importantly, he tends to lose inner contact with the meaning, the inner significance of what he is studying. The relation of the data to himself as a person is lost. Certainly the originality and the ingenuity of the student tend to be denied because they are not pragmatically useful. The imagination, as Dwight MacDonald puts it, tends to be bypassed. But isn't it exactly any person's originality that makes him an individual of significance, that gives him his experience of himself as one unique pattern of sensibility who at one instant is experiencing a particular relationship to other people and to the world about him? This is the way I know myself, this is the way I experience myself as an identity. I am not denying that we humans are social creatures and that we have much in common; most of us like the taste of steak, and most of us are thrilled by a couplet from Yeats and the drawings on a Greek vase. These likes we share, and we share a million other things at the same time. But what is the pearl of great price? It is the I sharing these tastes with you, it is I experiencing this joy in the poetry that you also may experience, it is I to whom a new world was opened by the Greek vase. If this "I" experience is lost under the pressure of my trying to remember what my professor said about the dates and geography of this vase, then I shall lose my aesthetic and my spiritual sensibility as well.

Let me illustrate this with an experience of mine in teaching last summer at Harvard. There I played a recording of a psychotherapeutic interview to my large undergraduate course of 200 students. These students were quite immediately able to hear what the patient was saying, and to tell me, now the patient is angry, now he is sad, and so on. But when I played that same recording to my graduate seminar, which was composed of a small group of students with professional training—chiefly psychiatrists and psychologists—they were surprisingly less able to discern what the patient was feeling. The naive sophomores and juniors could hear the communication from the patient and could perceive what was going on. The sophisticated graduate students, who knew all the dynamics and mechanics of human reactions, were definitely unable to hear the actual person. The graduate students gave back to me what they had read in books, they gave formulations of this and that dynamic, and they never heard the human being. Their knowledge about human behavior as external, discrete facts got in the way of hearing and seeing the person. The kind of knowledge they had acquired actually made their reactions less accurate than the reactions of the sophomores and juniors. It seems to me that if we want to talk about the truth of facts, we must be more profound than to phrase our argument in terms of statistics. A fact may be accurate or inaccurate, but it takes its meaning from the pattern in which it falls. Facts by themselves are not simply true or untrue. All one can say is that a fact is related to something. I am arguing that even our capacity to perceive relationships, which is the basis for our capacity to see the meaning of facts, is dependent upon the sensitivity and the flexibility of our human consciousness.

Of course, for my graduate students, there was the competitive factor. The undergraduates did not need my recommendation to get to the next class. The graduate students did; and they didn't want me to fail to give this recommendation. It is amazing what kind of dictatorial power we professors have over these creatures! When I read arguments that training psychologists and psychiatrists is simply brainwashing, and getting a PhD is a matter of being able to endure brainwashing, I realize that no matter how cynical these arguments are, there is enough truth in them to make us professors lie awake from time to time at night. The perpetual piling of facts on facts that my graduate students have become adept at made them lose immediate relationship to their subject matter.

The formula and the testing machine intervene between the student and the human beings he purportedly seeks to understand. There is greater and greater distance between our sensibility and our data. The PhD thesis all too often becomes not the material that is the original subject of the thesis, but rather the aspects of the material that are susceptible to computer coding. And so, in effect, what graduate students are studying is method, and the method is dictated by the machines we have to study it with. The use of the machine to codify tremendous accumulations of data is an inevitable development, and I'm not talking against it. But what I am saying is that our consciousness must be sufficiently strong to give heart and content to this technical form. We are inevitably in our day more and more separated from our data, and we find always intervening between us and the material we study, or between me as a psychologist and the human being I study—or you and your study or your work—more and more formulations, more and more machines, more and more points for testing. If all of us today find this distance growing, the only answer is that the consciousness of the persons involved must be sufficiently strong to overcome the distance; we must still have the possibility of studying Shakespeare, not simply his punctuation. My own consciousness must be strong enough to hear my patient as he speaks to me rather than the million dynamics I know about the unconscious mechanisms of human behavior. Can we take research data and by the force of our own consciousness translate it into what it means to a human being? I believe this is the only way science is advanced. Science has not advanced by the accumulation of fact. A couple of months ago I participated in a conference on the problems of humanistic psychology. Dr. Rene DuBos, one of the participants, who is a biologist and head of the Rockefeller Institute, said that he had gone through all of the important discoveries made during these last several hundred years and not one had been made by the piling of fact upon fact. Rather discoveries are made by the scientists' perceptions of the significance of relationship; by the scientists' perceptions of the meaningful pattern among facts.

It is becoming progressively harder with the tremendous diversity of facts to find these significances, these meaningful patterns, but we must find them. Else, not only will we become tools of our machines, but also our very science will become undermined. These inevitably depersonalizing processes unfortunately fit what many of us have been teaching for many years. We have been telling our students that individuals are only reflections of social needs and forces, and it is not surprising that they have come finally to believe what they have been told. We have been telling them that they are merely bundles of conditioned reflexes, that freedom and choice are illusions. This, too, the students at last have come to believe. It is not surprising, then, that they should experience themselves as depersonalized, immobilized, and should therefore experience anxiety. I don't for a moment mean to imply that any particular psychological or sociological theories are responsible for our historical predicament. I am sure conditioned responses work on their own level (though I also happen to believe that the human being by his own consciousness provides the context within which this conditioning has meaning and without which it does not have meaning for the living, experiencing human being). But these theories and forms of education are always results as well as causes—reflections of our situation.

Specifically, what are the implications for the nature of continuing education? I have patients in New York who come to me in their thirties, and generally they have attempted to take courses all over the city. The question I have to raise with my patients is, "Are you going into this because it appears to be a substitute for the more difficult problems of your own anxiety?" The answer is not less continuing education, indeed we need more. However, continuing education has to be posited on a sound concept of what education is. If education is an expansion of consciousness, it is a parallel thing to psychotherapy. The whole issue of psychoanalysis in the long run is the expansion of consciousness by virtue of bringing out the self of which one has been unaware. Education should be the context in terms of which this search for identity can be most effectively made, but it cannot be a substitute for that search.

Those of you in continuing education could incorporate this notion in your statement of philosophy. You might state the belief that human beings are always in the process of development, and the fact of not being in the process of development is already a sign of some failure in life and is psychologically a sign of the development of neurotic problems. Continuing education presents a world in which the individual is enabled to experience himself and his relationships, discover what he wants in life, what his values are, and to determine what he chooses life to be for himself. According to what I am saying, psychotherapy is an intensive arm of re-education within a larger context, which in a healthy culture was taken care of by education and by art, religion, and values that went along with it. I think here we have a definition in which both continuing education and the special problems of identity which often require some intensive psychotherapy can be fitted together.

The existentialists were entirely correct in claiming that the essential question can only be postponed; it cannot be avoided. That is, I am the man who lives my life and nobody else is going to live it for me. I think that this plan of continuing education you have at Oakland is unique in that you are not adding a concept of continuing education to the concept of an education already given. You are saying that the essence of a man's education is a man's acceptance of the responsibility that he is the "I" in the center of his pattern of relationships and that you as educators are prepared, or trying at least, to help him all through life in a totality situation, that is in his job, in his relationship to society, and in his relation to his own inner meaning, to continue to grow and to expand in consciousness.

THE UNIVERSITY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

by

Margaret Mead

How are undergraduates going to learn to like learning so that they want more of it? The task Oakland University is trying to accomplish, Margaret Mead argues in this essay, is to change the idea of college and university education from the notion that it is terminal to the idea that it is a process that goes on throughout life. What we really want is for people to be addicted to learning, to be bored to death with the state of knowledge one had yesterday, and to realize that if one is not learning something new, the thing one knows becomes dead—dry as dust. This is a daring notion, but it is not easy to accomplish when one must start from the firmly established institution of higher education. Perhaps a new college can answer the question better than an old one, but the question still remains: how does an institution find its way when it must start in the middle?

Ideally one would like to start with people long before they enter college. Oakland must start in the middle with high school students who have learned that the key reason for going to college is to earn a degree, or with adults from the community who in mid-life find themselves with incomplete educations. The university must also start in the middle in an academic climate where attitudes and experiences are unsympathetic to the kind of continuing education being proposed.

In spite of the problems, Mead argues that it is possible to start in the middle. It takes a faculty prepared to start with students who have a different kind of upbringing, and make them addicted to learning. Soon they will be parents of children who will be brought up differently and the process will be started. The exciting thing about the Oakland program is that the University is taking the responsibility to innovate in this field and to accept a responsibility for the continuing education of alumni, wherever they may be.

* * *

MARGARET MEAD has conducted eight major anthropological expeditions, authored eleven books, co-authored three and edited four more. She is currently Curator of Ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York and Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University and is Visiting Professor of Anthropology for the University of Cincinnati and the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas.

THE UNIVERSITY AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

What we are concerned with today is innovation—innovation of a particularly daring kind. There is a familiar story, told during World War II, about the stranger who asks how to get somewhere. The person he asks tells him briskly, "You see, you go out, you turn to the right and go down two blocks until you get to a garage. . . . No, no, that won't do it. You go out, you turn to the left and you walk three blocks until you get to a church. . . . No, that's not it. You go out and you walk straight ahead. . . ." The story goes on and on, until at last, after all his hesitations and reversals, the person who is giving the directions says with conviction, "You can't get there from here!"

Now, everywhere people are trying hard—and Oakland, I think, is trying harder than most institutions—to figure out how to get somewhere from the wrong place. What it really comes down to is how an institution is to find its way to some new place when it must start in the middle. Oakland, more imaginatively than most institutions I know about, is facing up to the problems involved in trying to start in the middle.

How do you get a beginning if you have only a middle? How do you create a past if you are new? How do you build a future if you are old? These three questions, all rolled into one, are crucial ones, and the program of continuing education provides one way of attacking the problem as a whole. The task, as I understand it, is this: How to define what must be done if an institution, such as Oakland, recognizes that we must change our ideas of what college and university education are—give up the notion that they represent a terminal state and that degrees are the end (as though people didn't need to think any more) and recognize that education is part of life, part of a process that goes on all the way through life. Then, if we are to establish a new climate of opinion, a set of institutions and a kind of behavior that will allow people to continue learning in systematic ways throughout their lives, what kinds of changes must be made in our traditional modes of operation? And how shall we go about the task? These are the problems with all their multitudinous facets that Oakland is attempting to analyze.

We Must Start from Where We Are

In the first place, you who are involved in the Oakland experiment

γ

are taking the students you have and thinking about how these students can learn something about how to go on learning. They must learn how to go about a continual process of learning without antecedents. There are no alumni for them to learn from. They are brand new and you must take them as they are. Furthermore, nothing as yet has been done about the high schools where they learned that the only reason for going to college is to get a degree. (Of course, very soon something will have to be done about this high-school picture of why people go to college; it is part of the problem of developing a new state of mind in college.) Secondly, in the same program, you are experimenting with ways of allowing very young alumni—graduates who have just found jobs and roles in the community—to go on learning without stopping. And third, you are facing the complex problems of the drop-outs in the community, whoever they may be—the people who were discouraged by institutions that are not as good as this one, the high-school drop-outs, the people who received a technical education without any humanities, and the people whose education was so humane that they know nothing at all about science and technology. You have all the kinds of people who "left" school and moved "out" into the world before anyone really believed that education is a continuing process—all the kinds of people who happen to live in the area for which this institution is trying to provide some kind of systematic continuing education. You are in fact intervening in—starting in the middle of—a whole series of operations for any one of which one could write a very nice program if only one could begin in the beginning.

We educators could write a beautiful program now for two-year-olds, using everything we know, so as to bring them up to love learning all their lives. We would not punish them and we would not reward them (for this is even more devastating); instead, we would make the process of learning and discovery a self-rewarding experience. Starting with two- or four-year-olds would not be very hard. Starting with six-year-olds would be harder, with twelve-year-olds, harder still. Starting with eighteen-year-olds would be grim. But of course starting with the two-year-olds really means beginning with those who will start them off. Before children can learn the things we want to teach them, we must have the mothers and the teachers.

Today, in our kind of society, people in positions to make changes have really come to face the fact that one always has to start in the middle. This is one of the great differences between the present and the past, when innovators thought—as they still do in some revolutionary societies—that the only way to change whatever existed was to silence or kill off the people they had and to start afresh with some others. But in our kind of society, innovators believe that any person can start where he is. This belief is based on the knowledge that if one brings up children differently, the adults will also change. For while the adults are learning to treat children differently, they themselves are changing. In the same way, where teachers and administrators really have the idea that students should learn differently, the faculty will also change. People are beginning to realize that the middle point is a point of leverage—a point from which to begin to alter the society that we all live in. People are beginning to see that any change made at this point with sufficient vigor will change the rest, also.

As I understand it, those who are developing this program of continuing education have in mind the creation of a network that will extend over the United States, so constituted that each institution, each center in each city or metropolitan area, will be ready to receive on a reciprocal basis the alumni of the other colleges and each, in turn, will be able to direct its own alumni to centers elsewhere. The outcome, eventually, will be a completely reciprocal system in which each university center will have a sense of responsibility for all the postgraduates, all the post-professional people in its area. The different centers will take responsibility for providing what is needed for all those who were not in school yesterday but who may be in school tomorrow, for all those who need new skills, new educational interests or new ways of doing things, and for all those who realize that in a rapidly changing world everyone needs more systematic education—very often. I do not think we shall ever be able to say categorically how often people will need to go on with their education. I hope we shall not reorganize the educational world so that, in effect, it's back to school every ten years. We do not want a new static form. Rather, we are thinking about a kind of society in which those who need to learn and those who teach them will share the expectation that people will want to learn new things and believe that they are able to learn new things.

At present there are a great many unreceptive faculties in the United States. Where they are concerned, Oakland must become a kind of goad.

There are many institutions in metropolitan areas that would like to isolate themselves from the life of the city and to act as if their halls were set in the midst of green fields. Some no longer want part-time students, and by the simple device of insisting that every graduate student must have the money to be in residence full time, they are keeping part-time students out. Why, under these circumstances, students should want to go to a graduate school in a city is anybody's guess. There are, after all, only two good reasons for deciding to study in a city. First, the student who has to do it that way can get work and study part time. And second, the student, while he is studying, can be part of a living community and related to all the activities that are going on in it.

Now here is a basic difficulty that must be faced. Is a university willing to be receptive to everyone around it and to take responsibility for every person in the wider community who wants to learn something? Or will it draw in its skirts and specialize in producing B.A.'s, M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s? There is the further difficulty that if every institution wishes to boast about the number of Ph.D.'s that adorn its faculty, this in itself will encourage the kind of university that concentrates on producing very large numbers of Ph.D. candidates at the fastest possible rate. The two attitudes are reciprocal, and the issue must, I think, be considered very seriously. Is the most important thing about an institution the number of Ph.D.'s gathered into its faculty? One striking thing about Ph.D.'s is the number of them who never write anything worthwhile after they have completed their Ph.D. dissertation. In this sense, they represent the most educationally "finished" people one can imagine.

All my life—well, not quite all my life, but ever since I started school and began taking examinations—I've had a very special form of the examination dream. In the dream I'm in absolute agony because I have flunked some examination—and then I remember that I have a higher degree and that resolves the dream. I have a Ph.D.—I can't flunk freshman algebra. I can never flunk freshman algebra, nobody can get me in a room and examine me in freshman algebra, and never mind whether I could possibly pass it now or not, I once did. One of the very few irreversibles in our society is the academic degree. It cannot be taken away from anyone. It is like having a child, if you are a woman; once you've had one, no one can ever undo that birth. There are very few irreversibles for men, but getting a degree is one. You can betray your country, you can commit a murder, you can become a drug addict—you can do all sorts of things, but nobody can take away your B.A. This is what we have been building up to in our educational system—getting these irreversible degrees that no longer have to be lived up to, once one has them. From the time one has a degree, one is set for life.

Such a situation has to be looked at very carefully. If our aim as teachers is to teach students that people go on learning and changing and growing and that they can, at any point, move into the system and out again, then we cannot simultaneously teach them that a Ph.D. should be a requirement for everyone who wants to teach. But here we create a conflict for those who are trying to produce a first-class institution, since one of the signs of a first-class institution today is the number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty. Another sign is the number of books in the library. As a result, universities and those who teach in them are trying simultaneously to do things that are basically incompatible.

Here I should like to suggest a mark of a really lively, innovative, mid-twentieth-century institution. How many people without a Ph.D. do you have on your faculty, who are so good that they got on anyway? Some of the liveliest places in this country have very good people of this kind. Why should poets have Ph.D.'s? No one has ever proved that a higher degree does a practicing poet any good, and one reason that the humanities are as dead as they are in some places is that they are represented by people with Ph.D.'s who talk about creativity but who have never created anything themselves. Those who are busy creating things may not have time to work for degrees. Now I mention this only as one aspect of the conflict you at Oakland will find yourselves in as you try to produce a first-class, exciting, modern college with very high standards for undergraduates, who will not expect to be "finished" someday very soon. For the only way one can feel not finished oneself is continually to meet other unfinished people who are moving along.

And now, what about the community? Oakland aims at creating a flexible learning culture in our society that will support adults of all ages in pursuit of their personal goals of understanding. We want a system that simultaneously will serve the very specific needs of the young engineer who badly wants tutoring by a hard-to-corner specialist, the curiosity of the retired army officer who really wants to learn a little philosophy, and the reawakened interest of the middle-aged mother who now wants the excitement of learning the kinds of things that are part of getting the B.A. Oakland envisions a program that will systematically place the best available educational resources at the disposal of the adult at every stage of development. There is a hidden blessing in such an ideal. If systematic education is open to people at every stage in life, those who seek it out will be of different ages. One thing that is lacking on college campuses today (except where there is continuing education) is the opportunity to live with and learn about people of different ages, the opportunity to discover what has happened to them and what might happen to oneself. Even more exciting is the aim of spreading this conception of learning to other institutions all over the country. Here, Oakland is saying to other institutions, in effect, "You must take responsibility for our alumni and we will take responsibility for yours," and in this way alumni will cease to be people on whom universities depend but for whom they do very little. Instead, universities would be centers for all graduates throughout their lives—each one a vital center for an entire community of developing adults.

How Can We Create a Desire to Learn?

This is an exciting prospect. But it brings us at this meeting back to the problem of how undergraduates are to learn to like learning enough so they will want to do more of it. In some ways, this is our most serious question. It may also be a question to which a new, young college can give a better answer than an old one, and one good reason for Oakland to make the attempt. Years ago when some of us social scientists did a small piece of research on food habits for the Public Health Committee of the Cup and Container Institute, we discovered that it is easier to have new ideas in a new place. At a time when paper cups were relatively new, we set up a series of experiments to find out whether people were more willing to drink a familiar drink or a new drink in a paper cup. Though it was a simple piece of research, the results were interesting. For it turned out that people are more willing to drink a new kind of beverage in a new kind of cup than they are to drink an old one in a new cup or a new one in an old cup. Coffee was attached to a coffee cup, tea to a teacup, and milk to a glass. Whenever an old drink was put in a non-traditional container, people were upset; but they were more willing to try a new kind of container with a newly invented drink called by a new name. By analogy, you are doing much the same sort of thing in this institution. You are a new college, and fewer people will object to the new ideas you produce.

But how will you get these new ideas over to students who have already had twelve or more years of education? Some of them, in fact, have had practically no life at all outside of school. Looking at the continuing education program from one point of view, it might appear that always keeping children in school is one way of getting them to want to stay in school. It might seem that the children who were hustled off to school at the age of two would be the ones who were really prepared for lifetime devotion to education. But, on the whole, it does not work out this way. College teachers are finding out today that most college students with this experience feel they have had enough school. Quite a lot of them had enough before they came to college.

Other institutions and agencies have their drop-out problems, too. The Poverty Program talks about the children who are drop-outs from the first day of school. On that first day they decide that they do not understand a word the teacher is saying and that she does not understand them—that she never will understand them and that they never will understand her—and they give up then and there. Nevertheless, these children are shut up for sixteen years in what amounts to a prison where they never learn anything. Some of them make very little headway; others manage somehow to pull through.

Among the students who are well enough "prepared," there are a fair number who would not go on to college if they did not have to. They have been told, "If you don't go to college, you won't get a decent kind of job. If you don't go to college, you won't get anywhere. College today is what high school was once, and you know that no one got anywhere without a high school education." Those who are persuaded by these arguments go to college for utilitarian reasons. It is a way to get somewhere and to get there as quickly as possible. There isn't any reason for enjoying learning or for prolonging the process. The thing is to get it over with, like basic training in the army. It is hard to teach this group how delightful learning can be and how lovely it will be to be learning at thirty-five, at fifty, or at eighty. The prospect is not one for which this group is likely to feel enthusiasm.

One of the most percipient things I have heard today was said by a young interviewer, who exclaimed, "But education is painful, I don't know anyone who would go and get any more of it!" Yet, somehow, if the continuing education program is to take hold, learning—and the desire for learning—must become habitual. I use the word habitual because, I suppose, addictive has connotations we would reject, even though, in a sense, we really do want to make everyone mildly addicted to learning. One of our aims as educators is to induce in our students a mild form of addiction—a state in which people get so used to something that they don't wish to do without it. What we really want is for people to be addicted to learning something new, to be bored with the state of the knowledge they had yesterday—the knowledge that is already chewed, predigested, memorized for examinations—and to realize that if they are not learning something new, the things they already know will become dead, dry as dust, dusty and dead.

How are we to induce this kind of addiction? In a mild form. Of course, we do not want to encourage the perpetual students who still can be seen occasionally on American university campuses. Typically, the perpetual student is someone with a small income, possibly from a trust fund with a provision for paying for education as long as the recipient continues to study on a campus. There are also a few who are related to the draft in rather complicated ways. They are not our concern here. But if an important part of the continuing education program is to discover the kind of college life that will make students value continued education, one major piece of research has to do with just this question: What must a college do to ensure that students will acquire an addictive attitude toward learning? Whatever it does must not be so extreme that students cannot bear to leave school or that they will all want to become college professors. We in this country need people for many other activities in our society. We want only a limited number of people to become so attached to the academic life that they will stay within it permanently. In fact, one of the problems we must face—a problem that will become more acute in the future—is how to get much more interchange between the campus and the larger community. How can we develop more and better ways of moving people in and out of government, industry, and the academic world, as well as back and forth between activities with a national and with an international scope? We need, and we shall need even more people who can see possibilities for combining academic life with other kinds of activities. We need to encourage the individual who will sit down and think, "Well, I might teach for a few years. Then it would be interesting to take an overseas assignment. And after that I'd like to get into government and use what I've lived through and learned overseas. And after that. . . ."

Implicit in the idea of continuing education is the expectation of doing different things at different periods in one's life. Americans despise getting into a rut, but the expectation of doing the same thing for a lifetime is consistent with the idea of terminal education. Once a person has finished school, he is set for whatever it is he is going to do and he won't ever need any more training because he will stay with what he has. Perhaps a young man or woman has been admitted to the bar, has passed the Boards, or has his or her Ph.D.—and is it forever. All that is necessary is to prevent anyone else from becoming more it than oneself for the rest of one's life.

Among the very effective stimulants for students who are acquiring new attitudes toward continuing education will be a faculty whose members are pursuing the same educational goal—continuing education—colleges and universities will need faculty who are deeply interested in the whole world around them and concerned with how to rouse interest in others. They will need the teacher who views his students in terms of what these students may become in twenty or thirty years. In looking for teachers of this kind, the university is making a search for the kind of imaginative, open-ended vision that was once required of the good elementary school teacher. She had to see her children going ahead—some to high school, a few to college, and perhaps one into medicine or the law—and this kind of vision was very exciting. This vision in the teacher's eyes makes it possible for the students to learn. But how can teachers maintain any vision of the future when they are faced by students who expect to stay only as long as they must and who are just bearing their educational experience—no more than that.

Let Us Welcome the Drop-Outs

I think, in the future, colleges will have to welcome drop-outs. If I were teaching in an undergraduate college today, I would discuss dropping out as an immediate option. I would begin by saying, "Now some of you may be interested in staying for a semester or a year. . . ." If we adopted this viewpoint, students would not have to go through the turmoil they now do, refusing to turn in papers for twelve weeks or living through fits of depression, before they succeed in indicating to someone that they do not want to learn anything more now. One of the things that will give students greater zest, that will make them mildly addicted to learning, will be a greater sense of freedom of choice. Sometimes a friend comes to me, very disturbed, and says, "Bill isn't going to stay in college. He doesn't believe in it anymore. He says everything in college is totally divorced from life." And I answer, "Of course, this is what lots of students are saying. He's not unusual." The student I wonder and ask questions about is the one who goes straight through. Then I say, "That's a very unusual student. What happened?" I think that cultivating a student body who are in college at any particular time because this is where they want to be will make a difference for everyone. Most of the students now in college would still be there, but they would be there with different attitudes and with goals more relevant to their lives as whole individuals.

To come back to the beginning, the big problem for Oakland today is, perhaps, starting in the middle. Inevitably, you who are concerned with this new program are starting with students whose earlier experiences with education were far from ideal. You cannot go back and undo those experiences. They are there—too much school, too much dull school, too many years of American history taught by rote, the wrong mathematics. And yet there is no other starting point. And if between you, between the students and the faculty, you can discover how to bring about a desirable state of mild addiction to learning, all educators and students will be a little farther along. Educators will be able, in time, to start with students who have had a different upbringing. For, in the not so distant future, today's students will be the parents of children who can be brought up differently. The process, begun here, will be under way, and the new possibilities will spread throughout our society. The exciting thing, here and now, is that Oakland University is taking the responsibility for innovation in this field and, starting where everyone is now, is proposing to take responsibility, in a sense, for all alumni in this country and in other countries of the world.

UNDER DISCUSSION

by

James B. Whipple

Although each paper in this series has its own integrity, they are bound together by a concern for the changing character of society. They are bound together also by a concern for individuals and for ways people can develop meaningful lives in an impersonal, technological society which appears to destroy traditional values and meanings. They are bound together by a concern for the part education—including continuing education—must play if we are to achieve a measure of self-realization in our kind of world. One might offer the papers without further comment; however, the discussion, which was part of the symposium, adds another dimension to these deliberations, pointing up especially the potential contribution of continuing education.

The discussion covered many hours, included many persons, and ranged far and wide. And yet, it is possible to identify a single mood running throughout—anxiety. The participants were anxious undergraduates, concerned and probing for meanings for their lives in this complex and changing society; and anxious faculty members, equally concerned and probing to understand their roles as both scholars and teachers with the attendant awesome responsibility to help improve the quality of life and society. But to borrow Rollo May's distinction, by and large, the anxiety was normal, not neurotic. With this kind of "normal" anxiety, the general outcome was creative rather than destructive, and the participants looked ahead toward more effective education for youth as well as adults in the future.

A surprising fact was that the papers did not provoke discussion regarding the changing society. All speakers emphasized the changing situation, but no one in the audience chose to question or explore their assumptions. To cite one example—Margaret Mead introduced the concept of "starting in the middle" to effect change in established institutions. This important notion, however, did not produce a single comment during the ensuing six hours of open discussion. But given the humanistic leanings of the four authors and the purposes of the symposium, at a second look, perhaps this is not surprising. Actually, none of the social changes emphasized were unfamiliar; and, furthermore, they were presented in a context of pressing needs for change in our views of education, and especially in our attitudes toward continuing education. This emphasis provoked participants to turn directly to the implications for themselves as individuals—living, learning, and teaching in this different kind of world.

Listening to the discussions following these speeches, from my vantage point, the anxieties expressed in the discussion turned in three directions: toward concern for the individual, toward education as a system, and toward the role of the teacher.

Discussion about the Indidivual

The issue of the individual in our changing society was raised most dramatically early in the symposium series by a student who asked Max Lerner, "What convinces you that a meaningful life is possible?" Over the weeks, conversation ranged broadly around various aspects of the question, frequently returning to the notion of conformity—the maintenance of a delicate balance between the ability to capitalize on the advantages of technological and social standardization on the one hand and the election not to conform on the other. Lerner, and later Mead, tried to distinguish between standardization and conformity. As Lerner put it:

> I may drink beer out of standardized bottles, eat food out of standardized cans, and buy shoes that have been made by the hundreds of thousands, but the kind of thoughts that I think and the kind of person that I am need not be standardized. . . . Conformism has little to do with mechanism. One of our great fallacies is that machine culture means conformist culture. It doesn't necessarily; in fact, machines very often have allowed people for the first time in history to live unique lives and become selves, genuine selves.

A closely related problem was concerned with creativity. How can we be creative when our institutions, including education, tend to stifle it? How can we develop Lerner's intersecting centers of creativeness drawn from many classes rather than a single elite? Perhaps, as Drucker suggested, the problem rests in understanding what we mean by creativity. He proposed a relatively simple and manageable definition—"a matter of seeing new patterns or insights from old things."

There was considerable preoccupation with problems of work and leisure. In the words of one panelist, we face a paradox of a work-driven elite providing leisure for masses who are not prepared to use it profitably. Lerner's suggestive resolution of the paradox was to reject conventional description of leisure as non-work or work as non-leisure: "We are now at the point where we can resolve this dichotomy that has plagued us and can say work is an activity directed toward some purpose and is something you do because you can't help it, whether it is done on the job or off the job." This is in contrast to leisure or play which is aimless.

Throughout the symposium there was a recurring anxiety expressed concerning identity. What is the pattern of an individual's relationships to himself, to others, and to society, and what is the meaning of these relationships? How do we deal with recurring crises—at college age, those restless years when students often get the feeling, "What are we doing here"; at age thirty-five, which May characterized as "facing the existential fact that I'm on my own; neither God, nor the college degree nor my parents nor my wife nor anything else is going to take care of me; a sudden recognition that if I fall no one is waiting to catch me"; at age fifty-five when one must "pick up the pieces of the mistakes that were made twenty years before." May goes on to say, "If you chose wrongly, if you cut off the vital aspects of yourself at thirty-five, then in the early fifties you end up in my office in despair. . . . The truncation, the withdrawal, the apathy, the lack of zest, the giving up of genuine hope at thirty-five is a symptom of the failure to continue to grow educationally. . . . It's a symptom of having expected that my college would do the whole job."

The special problems faced by women—perhaps a very particular kind of identity crisis—was another recurring concern at the symposium. Margaret Mead summed up the frustration of her sex this way:

> To begin with I don't think women are playing an increasingly significant role in society. There is a smaller proportion of women in graduate school, today than there were in the twenties. Women are not going into professions in any significant number. They are going into technical, white-collar operations where they make up for the fact that we are short of cheap, educated labor. There are only a handful of professional women in this country today compared to what there were twenty-five years ago; so don't kid yourself that we are in a wonderful period of women going into the professions. . . . If you look at the report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, you will find that it is entirely concerned with getting wom-

en out of the home, with almost total neglect of the fact that the way the home is organized today you can't get women out of it without enormous demands on her and her husband, because he's the only help she's got. He's got to make up for grandmothers, maiden aunts, serfs, slaves, peasants, eunuchs, and everything else we used to have.

Discussion about Education

When it came to education, the spirit of the symposium was critical. The nature of the deliberations, with their emphasis on change, undoubtedly invited responses reflecting disenchantment with the system, with the lack of connection between education and the rest of life, and with the present emphasis on specialization and training. By and large, criticism traversed familiar ground. The graduate school was taken to task for its increasingly narrow specialization and its tendency to kill excitement and zeal in graduate students, or as Lerner put it—"to look at them with a 'cold eye,' asking, 'Where is your footnote . . . What is your reference?'" Closely related were the complaints about research, often a petty and useless exercise retracing ground that has been covered by others—in Lerner's terms, an emphasis on "research instead of on the intellectual process, which is one of search."

Especially during the discussion with Margaret Mead, the grade system and all the accompanying paraphernalia for punishment and reward were attacked for their questionable effect on the zest for learning. In a similar vein, participants criticized the lack of intellectual community where there was spontaneous interaction between student and teacher or student and student.

Another cluster of questions in relation to contemporary education aimed at the relationship between education and the outside world. To what extent can academic experiences on campus be relevant to the larger community? To what extent do the dry-as-dust facts of the curriculum come alive "to make sense for the I and my world"?

A final group of questions concerning education dealt with the perennial debate over education or training, with Lerner trying to minimize the propensity toward invidious comparison, arguing that the acquisition of skills was necessary for everyone and sufficient for many. Drucker traced the downgrading of training for people to "our failure to discover and impart the conceptual tools needed with natural aptitudes in order to make their skills truly effective and gratifying." He suggested the need for a new educational concept, the S.Q. or skill quotient. This could restore skill training to a much needed place of respect in our culture.

Discussion about Teachers

Anxiety about teaching was expressed around three basic concerns. First, what are the characteristics of good teaching? Is the charismatic teacher the best answer? Can we expect good teaching with large classes? Over the four sessions, a number of suggestive answers were proposed. Instead of trying to get people with charisma, a difficult solution in view of its rarity, Mead proposed we seek, as a more attainable goal, persons with another kind of quality—a belief that what they do or teach makes a difference. Lerner raised the issue of the fragmented nature of the efforts of the individual faculty member, and saw the teaching problem as one of transforming an atomistic college faculty and student body into an intellectual community where a dialogue can take place between the faculty and student, between the experienced and the inexperienced. One panelist reminded the symposium that the absence of intellectual community could be explained in part by a dependency relationship in which the student looked to the teacher for direction and answers. "College instructors," he argued, "ought to be willing to assume a colleague role with students so that students, regardless of age, will be encouraged to look at their own potentialities and abilities for making an active contribution to the learning process—encouraging them to commit themselves to a course of action in the educational experience." Mead also underlined the importance of dialogue in her comments on the subject of large classes. "It is not necessarily large classes or other mass teaching devices that give us trouble," she observed. "The problem is that students don't talk to each other."

The second basic line of inquiry on teaching was related to the responsibility of the teacher for the individual student. Is a teacher's responsibility simply to teach the subject matter? Lerner argued that it was more—a relationship about a whole range of problems that concerned the student. A more difficult question dealt with the teacher's responsibility for the range of students from superior to average, or even below. Lerner's answer was to endorse Dewey's concept of equality of concern. "This is not an argument for mass education at the lowest common denominator," Lerner insisted. "We must search out and encourage an elite, but we must be equally concerned that all students achieve their maximum potential." To Dewey's concept, Lerner added the notion that we also owe individuals a continuity of concern, extending beyond a particular course and formal schooling into post-graduate years and continuing as long as the individual is developing.

Finally and understandably, basic questions were raised about the ever-increasing work load. Is there no end to the demands on the teacher? Lerner proposed that the answer lay in the teacher's sense of mission. "If we accept a responsibility for the education of the whole individual rather than the narrow part encompassed by a particular discipline, if we believe in engaging in a genuine dialogue with students, if we accept equality of concern and continuity of concern, no one can deny we have increased our burden. But I think we can carry it—I don't mind carrying a load if it is meaningful."

Educational Continuity

The connection between these deliberations and the Oakland University plan for alumni education rests in the context in which they took place. An underlying theme running through the entire symposium is the need for educational continuity—the need for continuing education in the truest sense of the word; not something we have called adult education, i.e., activity which is tacked on top of undergraduate schooling, but a continuing process of learning, beginning in college or even before and continuing into the years yet to come.

Furthermore, there was expressed deep concern for continuing education of a kind that goes beyond simple further training or retraining to maintain technical or professional competence—education that is liberal in substance. In these days when thousands of adults expect to "go back to school" for professional refreshment, programs to increase a person's technical or professional competence are offered in endless variety by universities or other educational institutions as well as industry, professional associations, and government. At least as far as acceptance goes, this kind of further education no longer presents a serious problem. Not only do people expect to go back to school, but our educational institutions even accept a responsibility to teach them.

The situation is quite different, however, when it comes to continuing liberal education, education for an individual's growth or for social change. Our first problem is that we tend to be overwhelmed by the apparent magnitude of the task. The mysteries of electronic brains, the new physics or biology, the wonders of space flights and countless other developments make us distort the importance of the so-called explosion of knowledge. And yet, in an address before the Association of American Colleges, January 12, 1966, Mark Kac, a mathematician, pointing out that between 1900 and 1920 we had the discoveries of Planck, Bohr, and Einstein, and between 1925 and 1940, the erection of the whole edifice of quantum mechanics, concluded: "Compared to these, our current explosion of knowledge begins to look like a pretty tame affair." He went on to argue that the acquisition of technical skills is relatively easy, and instead of being frightened by the immensity of knowledge, we must not lose sight of the fact that "one can know less but understand more."

The need for continuing liberal education is demonstrated in the constant preoccupation among symposium participants with questions relating to self-realization, with improving the quality of life in our changing society. As for our attitude toward continuing liberal education, we have overlooked a lesson taught us in the area of specialized education. We are not dismayed today, as we once were, that an engineer's education is out-of-date ten years after graduation. On the contrary, we make plans to keep him up-to-date, or to prepare him for further responsibilities, perhaps in management. Yet, when we come to education of the "whole" man, to liberal education, we still assume that college is the capstone that completes the education task once and for all.

Either directly or by implication, many symposium participants raised the perennial question: How is it that the liberal arts college is fumbling its responsibility in this area? One answer is that there is a failure to develop positive attitudes toward the need for continuing liberal education. Just as technology changes during the lifetime, so does society and the human condition. It is commonplace to talk of a "changing society" and we are learning more and more about the impact of new social situations on individuals. We also understand more and more about the stages of human development. Where once we talked about the child and the adult, we now recognize that both childhood and adulthood have many stages, each one with important implications for education.

At the symposium there was much discussion of adult "crises" at thirty-five and fifty-five—and a recognition that the undergraduate college cannot provide complete and final preparation for these changes, any more than the engineering school does for the changing technology. Although we recognize many elements of the changing situation and even their implication for continuing education, outside of the technical fields, as a society we are not doing much about it.

Continuing alumni education at Oakland University and the underlying spirit of the symposium represent significant attempts to deal with the issue of continuing education for a changing society and for personal growth.

APPENDIX I

SYMPOSIUM PANELISTS

Peter Drucker - Jan. 7-8, 1965

Stanley J. Idzerda	Director, Honors College Michigan State University
Dr. Ernest McMahon	Dean of Extension Rutgers University
E. Ross Hanson	Labor and Service Training Manager Marketing Staff Ford Motor Company Dearborn, Michigan
George Matthews	Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Oakland University
James B. Whipple	Associate Director CSLEA Brookline, Massachusetts

Max Lerner - Feb. 3-4, 1965

Hamilton Stillwell	Dean, Division of Urban Extension Wayne State University
Robert Young	Supervisor, Education and Training Chevrolet Engineering Center General Motors Corporation Warren, Michigan
George Matthews	
James Whipple	

Rollo May - May 2-3, 1965

E. Ross Hanson	
Allen Menlo	Associate Professor of Education School of Education University of Michigan

George Matthews	
Russell Kleis	Associate Professor of Adult Education College of Education Michigan State University
James Whipple	

Margaret Mead - May 17-18, 1965

Paul Malboeuf	Manager, Salary Administration Department Personnel and Organization Staff Ford Motor Company Dearborn, Michigan
Richard Schmuck	Program Associate Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge Institute of Social Research University of Michigan
Russell Kleis	
James Whipple	

APPENDIX II

THE OAKLAND PLAN FOR ALUMNI EDUCATION

Sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation
Established 1 February, 1963
Expanded and extended 1 February, 1966

Oakland University's Alumni Education Program stems from a conviction that institutions of higher learning should not only imbue their students with an insatiable curiosity and a commitment to continue learning throughout life, but also provide the long-range counsel and resources which will assist the postgraduate in fulfilling lifelong needs for education on as effective and timely a basis as possible.

The program pursues this goal by conducting activities in five major areas: (1) Undergraduate orientation: Early in their undergraduate years, Oakland students are made aware of the opportunities for and necessity of a continuing program of study for optimum achievement in their lives. (2) University-alumni-employer liaison: Employers of Oakland Alumni are informed of the University's educational commitment to its graduates. Oakland, the graduate, and the employer then join in identifying the educational experiences necessary for the graduate's optimum professional progress. (3) Counseling: Alumni receive periodic assistance in designing educational programs and determining those adult needs which educational resources, formal or informal, can serve. (4) Information center: The Alumni Education Department serves as a clearinghouse of information on the kinds of desirable programs available to the alumnus wherever he is located. Oakland itself does not expect to be the sole or even major source of educational programs for its alumni. (5) Research: The department gathers data on the actual learning needs of alumni. It also promotes pedagogical research designed to improve the undergraduate's comprehension of motivation toward continued learning.

In addition to intensifying the above activities, the recent expansion and extension of the Alumni Education Program will permit the development of a computerized information dissemination system which will search current periodical literature and distribute to the alumnus copies of those documents which match his profile of interests. The development of more intensive inter-institutional cooperation in providing alumni counseling and educational services will also receive priority attention. For further information, contact the Alumni Education Department, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

APPENDIX III

RELATION OF ALUMNI EDUCATION TO THE TOTAL UNIVERSITY

Recognizing that effective implementation of a philosophical concept requires a sound organizational base, Oakland University has sought the optimum in this respect by aligning those functions involving its commitments to alumni under the same administrative unit, the Division of Continuing Education. Thus in schematic sequence, Oakland's "lifelong learner" is first exposed to the continuing imperatives of education as an undergraduate through the office of Alumni Education (1) (in cooperation with the faculties of the academic departments coordinated by the University Provost); he becomes related to the Division of Continuing Education again during his career counseling and placement processes under the Director of Placement (2); subsequently he has contact with the office of Alumni Relations (3) through the operations traditional to that function; he again receives the services of the Department of Alumni Education (1) as it performs the experimental activities described elsewhere in this document; he may engage the educational programs of the departments of Courses (4) and Conferences (5); and he is afforded the continuing services of the Placement Office (2) in his subsequent considerations of professional alternatives. Combined, these activities comprise the University's team of professional resources committed to the lifelong needs of its continuing learners.

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUN 20 1969
on Adult Education